HISTORY OF GRAMMATICAL THEORIES IN TAMIL

BY

DR. P. S. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRI,

Principal, Raja's College of Skt. and Tamil Studies, Tiruvadi.

NĪR and NĪRKAḶ are mentioned by the author of Vīracōḻiyam. *Nīr* is only the contracted form of *nīyir* or *nīvir*, and *nīrkaḷ* is evidently double plural. Its commentator mentions that, sometimes, *nīyirkaḷ* and *nīvirkaḷ* also are used.[1]

NĪM is found in Cīvakacintāmaṇi and it is stated in its commentary that it is a *ticai-c-col*. It may have been borrowed from Canarese or may have been formed from *nī* through analogy with *nām*, *tām*, etc. This form is not found in any work written before Cīvakacintāmaṇi.

NĪYIR, NĪVIR and NĪR are mentioned by the author of Naṉṉūl. *Nīvir* may have been formed by the substitution of *v* for *y* between *ī* and *i* in *nī+ir* through analogy with *ivviṭam* (*i-v-v-iṭam*), etc. Since it is not mentioned by Tolkāppiyaṉār and it is not found in the earlier Sangam works, it may have been of later origin.

NĪṄKAḶ is a double plural formed from the plural *nīm*. This form is not found in works written before Cīvakacintāmaṇi. It is the only form that is now very largely used not only as honorific singular like *nīr* but also as plural.

The following quotations may serve as examples for the forms mentioned above :—

Nīyō peruma (you are great). (P. N. 5.3.)

Niṉṉai y-iṉṉāturṟa v-aṟaṉil kūṟṟē (the god of death who has unmeritoriously taken away your life). (P.N. 255.3.)

Niṉṉoṭu puraiya (to fight with you). (Pari. 11.67.)

Niṉakku iṟumpu taṉmai (your wonderful quality). (Pari. 23.3.)

Niṉṉiṉ ciṟanta niṉ tāḷiṇai (your feet which are superior to you). (Pari. 29.62.)

Nīyiru m-irunilaṅ kaṭanta (even you having crossed the wide tract). (Pattu. 131.28.)

1. V. V. 9. comm. cf. f. n. under 4.1 *supra*.

Varutu nīyirum (you too better come). (Pattu. 100.143.)
Nīr...toḻuminē (you better worship). (T. 19.1.)
Nīr tuḷaṅkal vēṇṭā (you will not desire). (C. C. 745.)
Aṭiyēṉ vantaṭaivaṉīmē (I, the slave, will resort to you). (C. C. 563.)
Nīṅkaḷ nōkkumiṉ (you better see). (C. C. 1045.)
Nīyir aivīrum (you five). (Kampar. A. 725.67.)
Uṅkaḷ kulattu tittōrkaṭkellām (to all who are born in your family). (Kampar. K. 247.78.)

What is the origin of the base 'UṈ' in the singular found in the medieval and modern periods? It seems to me that it was evolved out of the base *niṉ* of the ancient period in the following way :—First of all we see the form *nuṉ* used in the following sentences :—

Nuṉa cīraṭi nōva (to make your little feet suffer). (C. C. 1517.)
Nuṉpati-p-peyarkkum (going to your residence). (P. K. i, 32.93.)

of Cīvakacintāmaṇi and Peruṅkatai, respectively, works written between the 9th and 10th cent. A. D. *Nuṉ* may have been formed from *niṉ* by changing *i* to *u* through analogy with the vowel *u* found in the plural base *num*. Then in collocations like *nuṅkō-ṉuṉṉai* , . . (M. M. 283.100) which admit of being split up in two ways—*nuṅkōṉ + nuṉṉai* and *nuṅkōṉ + uṉṉai*, the latter alternative may have been adopted, and thus the form *uṉ* may have come into being. Now that the first appearance of *uṉ* is accounted for, it would scarcely be difficult to imagine how such a form may easily have become generalised. The following illustrations would make clear how such wrong splittings not infrequently serve as fruitful sources of new doublets in phrases involving sandhi between final *ṉ* and initial *n*.

For instance in *nōuṟṟu mūttu nāṉuntu kaṉṟā* (T. V. 1037.), the expression *nāṉuntu* is shown by Dr. Pope to be capable of being split in two ways as *nāṉ + nuntu* and *nāṉ + untu* though the earlier form *nuntu* appears in the sentence *nuntum pantapperumai* (T. V. 6.187). From this it will be seen how the doublet *untu* arose beside the earlier *nuntu*. Similarly in '*putalvarāṟ polintāṉuntai*' found in the Vipīṭaṇaṉ-aṭaikkala-p-paṭalam of the Yuttakāṇṭam in Kamparāmāyaṇam, the expression *polintāṉuntai* was wrongly split into *polintāṉ* and *untai* and the doublet *untai* arose beside the earlier *nuntai* recognised by Tolkāppiyaṉār. (Cf. Tol. E. 67.)

Forms with the base *uṉ* are not at all found in the early works of Sangam period like Puṟanāṉūṟu, Akanāṉūṟu etc. They begin to appear in very few instances in Maṇimēkalai and are freely used in Tēvāram, Tiruvācakam, Nālāyirappirapantam and other works written between the 5th and 9th centuries and they have almost ousted the old forms with the base *niṉ* in the modern period. The following may serve as examples for the same.

Niṉ peruntuṉpam (your great suffering). (M.M. 172.43.)
Orutaṉi niṉṟāy uṉṟiram aṟintēṉ (you stood alone and I understood your power). (M. M. 50.96.)
Uṉṉaṭiyēṉ uṉai niṉaintāl (if I, your servant think of you). (T. 31.2.) (*uṉai* for *uṉṉai*).
Uṉṉai yāṉ pirinta nāḷ (the day when I gave birth to you). (C. C. 2100.)
Uṉatu aṭiyē caraṇamē (your feet are my refuge). (P. T. 150.9.)
Uṉmēl ātaram perittu (regard for you is great). (P. T. 46.9.)
Uṉ maṉattāl (with your mind). (P. T. 44.1.)
Uṉ aṭiyār-tāḷ paṇivōm (we will worship the feet of your devotees). (T. V. 7.36.)
Uṉakkē aṭaikkalam (we are under you). (T. V. 7.73.)
Uṉṉai-p-piṟāṉ-āka (thinking you a stranger). (T. V. 7.35.)

Similarly the base *num* may have been replaced by *um*. Then the particle *kaḷ* may have been added to the base *um* so that we have two bases *um* and *uṅkaḷ*. In modern times, the base *um* is used in connection with honorific singular, and *uṅkaḷ* with plural. The following may serve as examples for the same :—

Umakku inta nāṭṭē vantu toṇṭarāṉa nāṅkaḷ (we who have come to this country and become your devotees). (P. T. 93.7.)
Umakkē āḷāy (being your men). (P. T. 92.4.)
Uṅkaḷ kulattutittōrkkellām (to all who have been born in your family). (Kampar. K. 247.78.)

NŌKKU : The first syllable in *uṉakku* is dropped on the principle of economy of effort and *a* is made the guttaro-labial vowel *o* by the influence of the labial *u*, before it is dropped.

The existence of two different bases *niṉ* and *num* in the ancient period for the oblique cases respectively of the second

person singular and second person plural in Tamil is similar to that of the base *tvat* and *yuṣmat* in the singular and plural of the second person in Sanskrit. Also the element '*m*' is found in the plural bases of both.

COLLECTIVE SECOND PERSONAL PRONOUN: Tolkāppiyaṉār mentions that *ellīrum* is second person and should be declined as *ellīr-nummaiyum, ellīr-nummoṭum*, etc. (Tol.E. 192). Naṉṉūlār mentions *elīr* in the nominative case (Na. 287) and *ellīrnummaiyum*, etc. in the oblique cases (Na. 246). Besides *ellām* may be used along with the oblique cases of the second person. But at present, the use of the oblique case forms of *ellīrum* have died out and those of *ellārum*, the demonstrative form in *uyartiṇai* and its poetical form *ellōrum* are used instead. e.g. *uṅkaḷ ellāraiyum vara-c-coṉṉāḷ* or *uṅkaḷ ellōraiyum vara-c-coṉṉāḷ* (She asked all of you to come). Sanskrit does not possess a similar collective second personal pronoun.

3.213322. *DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS* are of three kinds :—(1) Remote Demonstrative Pronoun (2) Proximate Demonstrative Pronoun and (3) Intermediate Demonstrative Pronoun.

3.2133221. *REMOTE DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUN* assumes in the ancient period the following forms in the nominative case—*avaṉ* in masculine singular, *avaḷ* in feminine singular, *avar* in epicene plural, *atu* or *aḵtu* in neuter singular and *avai* and *av* in neuter plural. (e.g.) *avvum piṟavum* (they and others) (Pari. 26.23). But in medieval and modern periods there are two forms *avar* and *avarkaḷ* in epicene plural and two forms *avai* and *avaikaḷ* in neuter plural. The oblique cases are formed by adding case-suffixes to the nominative forms without any change.

3.2133222. Similarly the forms of the *PROXIMATE DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUN* in the nominative case are *ivaṉ, ivaḷ, ivar* and *ivarkaḷ, itu* or *iḵtu* and *ivai, iv* and *ivaikaḷ*. (e.g.) *ivvum uvvum* (these and those) (Pari. 26.23). The oblique cases too are formed in the same manner as in the Remote Demonstrative Pronoun.

3.2133223. Similarly the forms of the *INTERMEDIATE DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUN* in the nominative case are *uvaṉ, uvaḷ, uvar, utu* or *uḵtu, uvai* and *uv*. These forms are gradually going out of use.

R. Swaminatha Aiyar[1] says, 'Old Tamil usage, however, clearly indicates that, in its inception, *u* was a far demonstrative and it is used as such in the Oldest Tamil works.' He derives *u* from *ava* through the intermediate stages *ō* and *ū*. Then he says that 'the demonstrative element *u* is of comparatively late origin.' The examples he quotes where *u*, according to him, is far demonstrative are from works which are later than Tolkāppiyam. In Tolkāppiyam, *uvaṉ*, *uvaḷ*, *utu* and *uvai* are mentioned along with *avaṉ*, *avaḷ*, *atu* and *avai*. If both the demonstrative elements *a* and *u* had had the same function at the time of Tolkāppiyaṉār, one of them would have died out even at his time. '*U*' may have been used in his time to denote objects at a distance and *a* to denote objects at remote distance.

Avar and *ivar* were used as honorific singular and *avarkaḷ* and *ivarkaḷ* as plurals at the time of the author of Vīracōḻiyam (V. V. 9.). But now *avar, avarkaḷ, ivar* and *ivarkaḷ* are all used both as honorific singular and plural. The *a* in Tamil *avaṉ*, *avaḷ*, etc., and *i* in *ivaṉ*, *ivaḷ*, etc. respectively have their parallels in Sanskrit, in *a* of *tat* and *i* of *idam*.

There was a collective third person plural pronoun which had the form of *ellārum* in the nominative case and *ellārtammaiyum*, *ellārtammoṭum*, etc. in the oblique cases. The insertion of *tam* is almost extinct in modern speech. Similarly, *ellām* in the nominative case and *ellānammaiyum*, *ellānammoṭum*, etc. and *ellāvaṟṟaiyum* and *ellāvaṟṟoṭum*, etc. in the oblique cases were used along with pronouns of the epicene plural and neuter plural respectively. (Tol. E. 190 and 191.) Even in ancient period the forms *ellāraiyum* and *ellāroṭum*, etc. were used in place of *ellānammaiyum*, *ellānammoṭum*, etc. e.g. *kaṭavuḷar ellārkkum* (to all gods). (Ka. T. ii, 559.36.) In the later periods if they are used along with the nouns in oblique cases which they qualify, the nominative form itself is used. e.g. *uyirkkelām* (to all living beings). (Kampar. B. 3312.)

3.213323. *REFLEXIVE PRONOUNS* are respectively *tāṉ* and *tām* in the nominative singular and plural. They are shortened to *taṉ* and *tam* in the oblique cases before they take case-suffixes. *Tām* also takes *kaḷ* in the modern period as other pronouns. The form *tāṅkaḷ* is now used as an honorific second

1. "Āryan Affinities of Dravidian Pronoun" read in the Third All India Oriental Conference, Madras, p. 7.

person singular also, when it is followed by a verb of the second person plural.

R. Swaminatha Aiyar says that "*taṉ* was in its inception merely a pronoun of the third person, and that a reflexive meaning has come to be superimposed so as to overshadow its original sense to such an extent that it has now come to be called the Reflexive Pronoun"[1] From the examples he has quoted it seems to me that the reverse may have been the case; for since there were the demonstrative pronouns *avaṉ, avaḷ, atu*, etc., there would be no need for another kind of pronoun of the third person in *tāṉ*. Tolkāppiyaṉār states that *tāṉ* and *tām* are respectively used in the singular and plural. He has not mentioned that they should be used only in the third person; besides, from the context of the sūtras dealing with *tāṉ* and *tām*, it is clear that he thinks that they could be used along with the pronouns of all persons and genders. Since the examples quoted by R. Swaminatha Aiyar are from works later than Tolkāppiyam, it seems to me that *tāṉ* and *tām* were originally reflexive in origin and their use has been so extended that they are used even as demonstrative pronouns.

R. Swaminatha Aiyar traces *tāṉ* to R. V. *tanu* and *tām* to *tman*[2] but in the present state of my knowledge, I cannot agree with him.

3.213324. *INTERROGATIVE PRONOUN*: The forms of Interrogative Pronouns that are found in Tolkāppiyam are *yāvaṉ, yāvaḷ, yāvar, yāar, yār, yāvatu, yā, yāvai*, and *evaṉ*. Tolkāppiyaṉār says that *yāar* can be used as the logical predicate of masculine singular noun, feminine singular noun and epicene plural nouns,[3] and that *evaṉ* may be used along with neuter singular and neuter plural[4] and also when the gender of the object that is questioned is not clear.[5] The oblique forms too

1. *Ibid.* p. 45.
2. *Ibid.* p. 47.
3. *Yāa r-eṉṉum viṉāviṉ kiḷavi*
   A-t-tiṇai maruṅkiṉ mu-p-pāṟku m-urittē.
   (Tol. Col. 219.)
4. *A-t-tiṇai maruṅki ṉ-iru-pāṟ kiḷavikkum*
   Okku m-eṉpa v-evaṉ-eṉ viṉāvē. (ibid. 219.)
5. *Yātu-eva ṉ-eṉṉu m-āyiru, kiḷaviyum*
   Aṟiyā-p poruḷ-vayiṉ ceṟiya-t tōṉṟum. (ibid. 31.)

at the time of Tolkāppiyaṉār had the base *yā*. In the medieval period *evaikaḷ* and *evarkaḷ* also were used. In the modern period the forms, *evaṉ*, *evaḷ*, *evar*, *etu* and *evai*, *evaṉai*, *evaḷai*, *evarai*, *etai* or *etaṉai*, *evaṟṟai* have almost taken the place of *yāvaṉ*, *yāvaḷ*, *yāvar*, *yātu*, *yāvai*, *yāvaṉai*, *yāvaḷai*, *yāvarai*, *yātai* or *yātaṉai*, *yāvaṟṟai*, etc. Hence the original interrogative root was *yā*. But Tolkāppiyaṉār himself mentions an interrogative form *evaṉ* and takes *ē* as one interrogative root and makes use of such words as *e-p-poruḷ*, *e-p-peyar*, etc. Hence it seems to me that, before the time of Tolkāppiyaṉār, *yā* may have been the base of the forms in the nominative case e.g. *yāvarum piṟarum*—(Pari. 55.8.) and *e* the base of forms in the oblique cases and that, at the time of Tolkāppiyaṉār, the base *yā* was generalised throughout e.g. *yāvarkkum cāyal niṉatu*—(Pari. 9.55.) and at the later periods *e* began to be generalised throughout e.g. *evaṉum itai-c-ceyvāṉ* (any one can do this), *evarkkum itu eḷitu*, (this is easy for any one to do) etc.—(*Colloq.*)

Dr. Caldwell thinks that *yā* was the original form and that *ē* must have been corrupted from it. But since the root *e* is found in the form *evaṉ* mentioned by him and *ē* is used as syntactic interrogative from the earliest times, it is also probable that *e* or *ē* may have been the original and *yā* may have been formed from it through analogy with *yāṉ*, which may have been formed from the oblique base *eṉ*.

In addition to these interrogative pronouns, there are three interrogative roots, *ā*, *ē* and *ō* which serve as syntactic interrogatives and are added at the end of nouns or verbs. e.g. *Avaṉā vantāṉ?* (did *he* come). *Avaṉ vantāṉā?* (did *he come*). *Avaṉē vantāṉ?* (did *he* come). *Avaṉō vantāṉ?* (did *he* come). *Avaṉ vantāṉō?* (did he *come*). Some of these as *ā* and *ō* denote mere question and the third *ē* denotes doubt etc.

3.213325. *RELATIVE PRONOUNS*: Tolkāppiyaṉār and other grammarians have not stated anything about relative pronouns. The purpose of the relative pronouns is served by the participles e.g.

Uṇṭi-koṭuttōr uyir-koṭuttōrē (food-givers are life givers). (P.N. 18.19.)

Ceyviṉai-k-k-etirnta tevvar (enemies who were against the actions done). (P.N. 6.11.)

Nirayaṅ koḷpavaroṭu (with those who go to hell). (P.N. 5.6.)

Cērvāṉa i-k-kaṇṭāl (if you see him who will mix with you). (T. 25.2.)

But in Maṇimēkalai and some of the later works the interrogative pronouns began to be used in certain instances as relative pronouns. This, it seems to me, is due to the adaptation of Sanskrit sentence form in Tamil. For instance, sentences like '*yātoṉṟu yātoṉṟu mūrttam atu aṉittam*' (whichever is *mūrta* is *anitya*) are found in plenty in Maṇimēkalai. This sentence is exactly the translation of the Sanskrit sentence '*yat yat mūrtam, tat tat anityam*'. The same idea may be expressed in Tamil as '*mūrttam āṉatu aṉittam*'.

R. Swaminatha Aiyar says that "the Sanskrit masculine *yāvān* appears to have been one of the earliest relative interrogative forms adopted in Tamil and other Dravidian languages". Two points are to be noted here :—(1) *Yāvān* is only a relative pronoun in Sanskrit and is never an interrogative, and it exists from a very ancient period; while the relative pronoun in Tamil is a recent introduction and *yāvaṉ* in Tamil was originally an interrogative pronoun ; (2) Besides, if *yāvaṉ* was derived from *yāvān*, why should the second '*a*' be shortened in Tamil? Again he says, "the interrogative *e* which appears initially in composition as in Tamil *e-p-peyar* . . . has apparently arisen from the imitation of such Sanskrit compounds and combinations as *yat-kāma* . . . . *yatkaraṇa*, etc. This *e* si another of the earliest relative interrogative forms adopted in the Dravidian languages. It is possible that the base *yad* has also given rise to the Dravidian pronouns, *edu, edi*." This appears to me to be an extreme view. The form *etu* in Tamil is only of later origin. The corresponding form is *yāvatù* in Tolkāppiyam. The *e* of *e-k-kālam* is formed in the same way as *a-k-kālam, i-k-kālam,* since, as Dr. Caldwell says, 'the Demonstrative and Interrogative bases are built up on those bases in precisely the same manner and obey one and the same law.'

3.213326. *PRONOUNS DERIVED FROM NUMERALS:* They are of two kinds, viz., *oruvaṉ, oruvar, iruvar, mūvar,* etc. which belong to *uyartiṇai* and *oṉṟù, iraṇṭù, mūṉṟù,* etc., which belong to *aḵṟiṇai.* The oblique cases of the former set of words are formed by adding the case-suffixes directly to them. In the modern period the forms *iruvarkaḷaiyum, iruvarkaḷālum,* etc. which are formed by adding the suffix *kaḷ* to *iruvar, mūvar,* etc., before adding the case-suffixes are also in use. The obique cases

of the latter set of words are generally formed by adding the flexional increment *an̠* between them and the case-suffixes. e.g. *on̠ṟan̠aiyum, iraṇṭan̠aiyum,* etc. The form *oruvar* was used at the time of Tolkāppiyan̠ār when the speaker was not sure whether the person he spoke of was a man or a woman. '*R*' in *oruvar* does not denote plural number.

3.213327. *INDEFINITE PRONOUNS: palla, pala, cila, uḷḷa, illa*—these words which correspond to indefinite pronouns are included by Tolkāppiyan̠ār in the list of *aḵṟiṇai* words. Evidently they are plurals. Their oblique cases are formed by adding the flexional increment *vaṟṟu* after them and before case-suffixes. e.g. *palla-vaṟṟai, cila-vaṟṟai,* etc.

Palar and *cilar* are not mentioned by Tolkāppiyan̠ār in the list of *uyartiṇai* nouns ; yet he makes use of *palar* in the sūtra '*palarar̠i collē* (Tol. Col. 7). They are found freely used in Puṟanāṉūṟu and other works later than Tolkāppiyam. e.g. *māyntician̠ōr palarē* (many have died). (P.N. 27.6.) *pāṭṭum uṭaiyōr cilarē* (there are a few who have songs composed on them). (P. N. 27.5.)

The word *piṟa* also may be placed on a level with *palla, pala,* etc. In the medieval period, *kaḷ* came to be added to it. e.g. *poypporuḷ piṟakaḷ* (other unreal objects). (C. C. 468.) *cilai-kaḷum piṟakaḷum* (and other stones). (C. C. 2158). From *piṟa,* the form of *piṟar* may have been evolved. e.g. *piṟar vēṇṭu pulam* (land desired by others). (Pattu. 197.80) : *piṟarum kūṭi* (even others having joined). (Pattu. 232.518.) This too got the addition of *kaḷ* in the medieval period. e.g. *piṟanta-v-akkuḻavikaḷ piṟarkaḷ yāvarum* (those born infants and others). (C. C. 2834.)

3.214. *NUMERALS:* 3.2141. *CARDINALS:* According to Tolkāppiyan̠ār, *on̠ṟu, iraṇṭu,* etc. are considered *peyar* when they mean one person or object, two persons or objects, etc.[1]. The number corresponding to *seven* is *ēḻ* at the time of Tolkāppiyan̠ār, while *ēḻu* has displaced it in the later periods. There is a tendency at the present day to use the word *orupatu* in place of *pattu*. It seems this tendency existed even in the ancient period (cf. Tol. E. 471 and 472) and in the 12th century since it is found in the inscriptions of that period. e. g. *nūṟṟoru-*

1. cf. *In̠aittenа-k kiḷakku m-eṇṇu-k-kuṟi-p peyarum* in Tol. Col. 168. cf. F. N. 10 in p. 87.

pattēḻum (one hundred and seven). (S. I. I. iii, i. 72.13 :) *irunūṟ-ṟorupattum* (two hundred and ten). (S. I. I. iii, i. 78.5.)

The substantive numerals, except *oṉṟu* are sometimes used as numeral adjectives. e.g. *iraṇṭu maṉitarkaḷ* (two men). When they are used as adjectives, they are not declined as in Sanskrit, *i.e.*, whatever be the case of the noun that it qualifies, only the nominative form is used. e.g. *iraṇṭu maṉitarai, mūṉṟu makkaḷāl* etc.

3.2142. *ORDINAL NUMBERS* are formed in Tamil directly from the cardinal numbers by adding *ām*, the shortened form of the verbal participle *ākum*. Hence we get the forms *oṉṟām, iraṇṭām*, etc. Similarly *āvatu* is added in place of *ām*. Hence we get the forms *oṉṟāvatu, iraṇṭāvatu* etc. Besides there is another form *mutal* for the first ordinal.

3.22. *VERBS :* 3.221. *DEFINITION :* Tolkāppiyaṉār states that *viṉai* does not take the case-suffix but is found generally denoting the tense also[1]. This is taken to be the definition of verb by his commentators; but it seems to me that Tolkāppiyaṉār did not intend it to be so, since the word *kālamoṭu* in the above sūtra suggests that the verb denotes something else besides time, and the word *niṉaiyuṅkālai* suggests that it is not compulsory that the verb should always denote time. This is borne out by the fact that the *kuṟippu-viṉai* or appellative verb like *kāṉakanāṭaṉai* (you are the lord of jungle tract) (P. N. 5.3.) does not denote time. Hence, in my opinion, Tolkāppiyaṉār does not intend this sūtra to be the definition of *viṉai* or verb. Then one may ask what its definition is. I think that he suggests it by the name *viṉai* itself which means action. In choosing that term he may have had in his mind the statements '*tad ākhyātam yēna bhāvam*' (R. V. P. 12.5.) and *kriyāvācakam ākhyātam* (S. Y. V. P. 8.46).

The author of Vīracōḻiyam also does not attempt to define *viṉai*, but suggests it by his word '*toḻiṟpatam*' in V.K. 1. The author of Nēminātam repeats '*viṉai-y-eṉa-p-paṭupa . . . .*' (Tol. Col. 198.) But Naṉṉūlār seems to define *viṉai* as that which denotes *ceypavaṉ* or doer, *karuvi* or instrument, *nilam* or place, *ceyal* or action, *kālam* or time and *ceyporuḷ* or object[2]. This

---

1. *Viṉai y-eṉa-p paṭuvatu vēṟṟumai koḷḷātu*
   Niṉaiyuṅkālai-k kālamoṭu tōṉṟum. (Tol. Col. 198.)
2. *Ceypavaṉ karuvi nilañ ceyal kālam*
   Ceyporuḷ āṟum taruvatu viṉaiyē. (Na. 320.)

cannot be its definition since a verb cannot denote all the above six things but generally only action and time and person. It is almost certain that this sūtra is only an adaptation of the sūtra

Viṉai-y-ē ceyvatu ceya-p-paṭu poruḷē
Nilaṉ-ē kālaṅ karuvi y-eṉṟā
Iṉṉataṟ k-itu-paya ṉ-āka v-eṉṉum
Aṉṉa marapi ṉ-iranṭoṭu-n tokaii
Ā-y-eṭ ṭ-eṉpa toḻiṉ-muta ṉilaiyē. (Tol. Col. 112.)

where it is said that, generally, eight things precede an action, *i.e., viṉai*[1] or *kṛti* mentioned by Sanskrit logicians, *ceyvatŭ* or doer, *ceyappaṭuporuḷ* or object, *nilam* or place, *kālam* or time, *karuvi* or instrument, *iṉṉataṟkŭ* or the recipient of the result of the action and *itu payaṉ* or the purpose of the action. Tolkāppiyaṉār does not seem to intend this sūtra as a definition of the verb.

The author of Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam seems to have seen this defect in Naṉṉūlār's definition of *viṉai* and also seems to have noted that the sūtra '*viṉai y-eṉa-p-paṭuva* (Tol. Col. 198) is also defective owing to his mistaken notion that it deals with the definition of *viṉai*. So he makes the addition '*poruṭpuṭai peyarcci pulappaṭup patuvē*' to Tol. Col. 198. Hence according to him *viṉai* is that which denotes action and time and which does not take case-suffixes after it.

3.222. *CLASSIFICATION*: Verbs are primarily divided into two classes, viz., *kuṟippu-viṉai* and *viṉai*[2] (latterly known as *terinilai-viṉai*).

---

1. It is worth noting that *viṉai in this sūtra alone* evidently means *kṛti*. *Kṛti* is quite different from *kriyā*. *Kṛti* denotes the volitional effort of mind and *kriyā* denotes the activity that follows volition. All the commentators mistake the word *viṉai* for *kriyā* or *toḻil*, as may be seen, for example, from the statement of Cēṉāvaraiyar '*vaṉaintāṉ eṉṟavaḻi, vaṉaitaṟṟoḻilum, vaṉainta karuttāvum*, etc.' and the repetition of the same by the author of Ilakkaṇa-viḷakkam (I. V. 226, Comm.). According to their interpretation the meaning of the sūtra becomes, *viṉai* or *toḻil* etc., precedes *toḻil*. How can *toḻil* precede *toḻil*? It may be noted here that the same word *viṉai* is used in other places to denote verb and the word *toḻil* also is used in the same sense.

Cf. *Peyarun* toḻilum *pirintoruṅ k-icaippa*.... (Tol. E. 133.)

2. *Kuṟippiṉum* viṉaiyiṉu *neṟi-p-paṭa-t- toṉṟi-k*
Kālamoṭu varūum viṉai-c-col l-ellām

3.2221. *KUṞIPPUVIṈAI* or appellative verbs are in the opinion of Tolkāppiyaṉār, those that are formed from the words denoting qualities as *āṟṟalēṉ* (I possess strength) (Pattu. 346. 29), from compounds made up of a word denoting quality and a word denoting any limb as *neṭuñceviyaṉ*, (he has sharp ears) from words made up of a noun and a particle denoting comparison as *poṉṉaṉṉaṉṉam* (we are like gold in colour). (P. N. 84.2.), and the verbs *iṉṟu*, *ila*, *uṭaiya*, *aṉṟu*, *uṭaittu*, *alla* and *uḷa*,[1] the forms like *kuṇṭukaṭṭu*, etc., and *illai* and *vēṟu*[2] which are common to all genders and numbers.

The author of Vīracōḻiyam seems to mention in V.K. 11 that *viṉaikkuṟippu* corresponds to the *bhāvēprayōga* in Sanskrit. Since the *bhāvēprayōga* in Sanskrit is used only in the third person singular to denote the action alone as *sthīyatē* for *sthiti* and the *viṉaikkuṟippu* is used in both the numbers of all the persons and denotes not only the action but also the person and the number, his view does not seem to be correct.

Naṉṉūlār adds to the list of appellative verbs given by Tolkāppiyaṉār the words formed from those denoting the time and place as *ōṇattāṉ*, *kāṉakanāṭaṉai* (P.N. 5.3.) and the word *uṇṭu*, and says that *uṇṭu* is common to all genders and numbers[3]. He also defines *kuṟippuviṉai* as that which can take only a

---

Uyartiṇai-k k-urimaiyu m-a:.ṟiṇai-k k-urimaiyum
Ā-y-iru tiṇaikkum-ō r-aṉṉa v-urimaiyum
A-m-mū v-urupiṉa tōṉṟa l-āṟē. (Tol. Col. 201.)

1. *Iṉṟila v-uṭaiya v-eṉṉuṅ kiḷaviyum*
Aṉṟuṭait- talla v-eṉṉuṅ kiḷaviyum
Paṇpu-koḷ kiḷaviyu m-uḷa-v-eṉ kiḷaviyum
Paṇpi ṉ-ākiya ciṉai-mutaṟ kiḷaviyum
Oppoṭu varūuṅ kiḷaviyoṭu tokaii
Appāṟ pattuṅ kuṟippoṭu koḷḷum. (ibid. 220.)

2. *Muṉṉilai viyaṅkōḷ viṉai-y-eñcu kiḷavi*
Iṉmai ceppal vēṟeṉ kiḷavi
Ceymmaṉa ceyyuñ ceyta v-eṉṉum
A-m-muṟai niṉṟa v-ā-y-eṉ kiḷaviyum
Tiripu-vēṟu paṭūuñ ceytiya v-āki
Irutiṉai-c coṟkumō r-aṉṉa v-urimaiya. (ibid. 222.)

3. Vēṟillai y-uṇṭaim *pāl-mū v-iṭattaṉa.* (Na. 339.)
Evaṉ-eṉ viṉāviṉai-k kuṟippu iḻi y-iru-pāl. (ibid. 350.)

subject before it and is not governed by any word in the second, the third, the fourth, the fifth or the seventh, case[1].

The author of Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam and other grammarians except the author of Pirayōkavivēkam have followed the author of Naṉṉūl.

It seems to me that the form *uṇṭù*[2] (from the root *uḷ*) which may have been used only as the neuter singular like *iṉṟù* and *aṉṟù* at the time of Tolkāppiyaṉār was generalised throughout so that it began to be used with all persons, genders and numbers from about the time of Naṉṉūlār.

The author of Pirayōkavivēkam seems to think that the *kuṟippuviṉai* which are formed from nouns correspond to the *nāmadhātus* (denominatives) found in Sanskrit. For instance, the Tamil appellative verbs, *pāmpaṇaiyāṉ*, *aṟuppāṉ* are similar in nature to the *nāmadhātus puttrīyati*, *kṛṣṇāyatē*, etc. But it seems to me that they (*kuṟippuviṉai*) are not so, though both are derived from nouns; for, *puttrīyati* means either he wishes to have a son or he wants to act like a son; similarly, *tapasyati* means he wishes to perform penance; *mālāti* means it acts like a garland and so on; but *makaṉēṉ* in Tamil (Ka. T. Vol. 2, 722, 7), means 'I am the son'. Hence there is a great difference in *sense*, between *nāmadhātus* in Sanskrit and appellative verbs in Tamil. Besides there is a difference in the *form* too. Generally, one of the particles *kyac*, *kyaṅ* etc. is added between the noun and the verbal terminations in Sanskrit denominatives, and such verbs are used in all tenses and moods. But in Tamil appellatives, the verbal termination is invariably added directly to the nouns and they have no tense-element in their forms.

Hence I may say that the appellative verbs form a special feature of the Tamil Language. Originally, they may have been participal nouns and later on used as logical predicates. Afterwards, they may have been included under verbs.

3.2222. *VIṈAI OR TERINILAIVIṈAI*: 3.22221. *CLASSIFICATION INTO SIMPLE AND CAUSAL VERBS*: *Terinilaiviṉai* may be divided under two heads—*taṉ-viṉai* or simple verb and *piṟa-viṉai* or causal verb. It should be clearly understood here that *taṉ-viṉai* and *piṟa-viṉai* do not at all correspond to

---

1. *Poruḷ-muta l-āṟiṉum tōṟṟi-muṉ ṉ-āṟaṉuḷ*
   Viṉai-mutal māttirai viḷakkal viṉai-k-kuṟippe. (ibid. 321.)
2. cf. *Iṭai-p-paṭiṟ kuṟuku m-iṭaṉu mār-uṇṭe*. (Tol. E. 37.)

ātamanēpada and *parasmaipada* respectively as stated by Dr. Caldwell.[1] For, *taṉ-viṉai* denotes an action done by the person or thing denoted by its subject, while *piṟa-viṉai* denotes an action done by one other than the agent denoted by the subject. But in Sanskrit if a root can take both *ātmanēpada* and *parasmaipada* terminations, the former are used when the result of the action goes to the doer and the latter when it goes to some one other than the doer.

Taṉ-viṉai is transitive (*ceya-p-paṭu-poruḷ-kuṉṟāviṉai*) or intransitive (*ceya-p-paṭu-poruḷ-kuṉṟiya-viṉai*) according as it takes an object after it or not. In the sentence '*vaṟumai nōkkiṉṟù*' (noted the poverty) (P.N. 141.15.) *nōkkiṉṟù* is transitive since *vaṟumai* (the accusative sign '*ai*' is elided here) is its object, and in the sentence '*cellāmōtil cilvaḷai viṟali*' (oh *viṟali* with a few bracelets, shall we go ?) (P.N. 64.2.), *cellāmō* is intransitive. Hence Dr. Caldwell's statement that the *taṉ-viṉai*......are all necessarily as well as formally, intransitives[2] is not accurate.

The terms *taṉ-viṉai* and *piṟa-viṉai* are suggested by Tolkāppiyaṉār by the words *taṉpālāṉum* and *piṟaṉpālāṉum* respectively in the sūtra

Itu-ceyal vēṇṭu m-eṉṉuṅ kiḷavi
Iru-vayi ṉilai-y-um poruṭṭ-ā kummē
Taṉ-pā l-āṉum piṟaṉ-pā l-āṉum. (Tol. Col. 243).

Peruntēvaṉār, the commentator on Vīracōḻiyam respectively calls them *kēvalatātu* and *kāritatātu*[3], while the author of Naṉṉūl uses the term *ēvalviṉai* for *piṟaviṉai*[4], perhaps not liking the Sanskritic denomination *kāritatātu*.

The statement of Dr. Caldwell that 'these verbs (causals) have been classed with transitives both by the native grammarians and by Europeans, and Beschi alone places them in a class by themselves and calls them *ēvalviṉai*'[5] is therefore incorrect.

---

1. C. D. G. 449.
2. *Ibid.* 450.
3. *Āṭiṉāṉ kēvala-t-tātu; āṭṭiṉāṉ kārita-t-tātu.* (V. Tāt. 6, Comm.)
4. *Cey-y-eṉ viṉai-vaḻi vi-p-pi taṉi-variṉ*
   Ceyvi-y-eṉ ṉ-ēva l-iṉai-y-i ṉ-īrēval. (Na. 138.)
5. C. D. G. 455.

3.222211. *HOW ARE CAUSAL VERBS FORMED?* Tolkāppiyaṉār has not stated how causal verbs are formed. But in the literature of the Saṅgam period, the following forms of causals are found :—

	Examples :	Quotations :
1.	*uyarkkuvai*	*naṭṭavar-kuṭi-y-uyarkkuvai* (Pattu. 217. 131) (You will raise the fallen families).
2.	*peyarkkuvai*	*ceṟṟavar aracu peyarkkuvai* (Pattu. 217. 132) (You will displace the sovereignty of the enemies).
3.	*pōkki*	*kaivēl kaḷiṟṟoṭu pōkki* (K. 774) (Having sent the hand-trident with elephants).
4.	*tolaicci*	*kaṭikāviṉilai tolaicci* (Pattu. 218.153) (Having spoiled the guarded state of forests).
5.	*kaḻippi*	*maṟṟai yāmam pakal uṟa-k-kaḻippi* (Pattu. 236.653). (Having spent the remaining part of the day).
6.	*tirutti*	*kōl tirutti* (P.N. 17.5) (Having reformed the scepture [rule]).
7.	*cērtti*	*paṟṟuvaḻi-c-cērtti* (Cilap. 337.108). (Having attuned it to a song called *paṟṟu*).
8.	*uruṭṭi*	*āḻi-tiṟappaṭa-v-uruṭṭi* (M. M. 61.76) (Having rolled the wheel so that it may become firm).
9.	*ōṭṭi*	*aḻittōṭṭi* (Ep. I. Vol. XVII, Part VII. V. G. 95) (Having driven after routing them).
10.	*vāḻtti*	*ataṉ tāḷ vāḻtti* (Pattu. 220.222) Having praised its feet).

From these it is seen that causals are formed from *taṉ-viṉai* (1) by the doubling of the consonant of the formative as in examples 1 to 5 noted above, (2) by the doubling of the initial consonant of the signs of tense as in examples 6 and 7, (3) by the doubling of the final consonant of the root as in examples 8 and 9 or (4) by adding the particle '*ttu*' to the root as in example 10.

In addition to such forms, the following forms are found in a few instances in Kuṟaḷ and in large numbers in the literature

written after the 5th century A.D. and in inscriptions of the same period.

uḻappikkum	*uḻappikkuñ cūṭu* (K. 938).	
nayappittār	*nayappittār nalkāmai* (K. 1190).	
āṭṭuvittāl	*āṭṭuvittālār oruvar āṭātārē* (T. 1229. stanza. 3).	
aṭakkuvittāl	*aṭakkuvittālār oruvar aṭaṅkātārē*	Do.
ōṭṭuvittāl	*ōṭṭuvittālār oruvar ōṭātārē*	Do.
urukuvittāl	*urukuvittālār oruvar urukātārē*	Do.
pāṭṭuvittāl	*pāṭṭuvittālār oruvar pāṭātārē*	Do.
paṇivittāl	*paṇivittālār oruvar paṇiyātārē* (T. 1229.3).	
kāṭṭuvittāl	*kāṭṭuvittālār oruvar kāṇātārē*	Do.
ceyvittāṉ	*tāmra śāsanañ-jeyvittāṉ* (I.A. Vol. 22, p. 71 M.M.P.).	
muṟṟuvikka	*vēḷvi muṟṟuvikka* (Ep. I. Vol. XVII. Part VII. V.G. 36).	

aṟuppippāṉai kattaṟuppippāṉai (T. 17.4).

Here two points may be noted :—(1) In words like *paṇivittāl, ceyvittāṉ, aṟuppippāṉai, vi* or *pi* is added direct to the root and (2) in words like *ōṭṭuvittāl, āṭṭuvittāl,* etc., *vi* is added to the causal forms *ōṭṭu, āṭṭu,* etc., of the roots *ōṭu, āṭu,* etc. Hence *ōṭṭuvittāl āṭṭuvittāl,* etc., may be considered as double causals. Perhaps, seeing such examples, the author of Vīracōḻiyam said in V. Tāt. 6 that the forms like *āṭṭu, āṟṟu,* are *kāritam* or causals and if *vi* or *pi* is added once after them, they become *kāritakkāritam* or double causals and if *vi* or *pi* is added twice after them as *āṭṭuvippāṉ,* they become *kāritakkāritakkāritam* or triple causals. But he has failed to note that *vi* or *pi* may be added direct to roots to make them causals even though examples like *uḻappikkum* and *ceyvittāṉ* were found before him.

Possibly to remove this defect Naṉṉūlār says that *ēval* or causals are made by adding *vi* or *pi* to the root and *īrēval* or double causals, by adding either of them twice or both once[1], and does not mention triple causals.

The author of Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam, though he agrees with Naṉṉūlār that *ēval* or causals are formed by adding *vi* or *pi* to the root [2], feels that the mention of *īrēval* is absolutely

---

1. *Cey-y-eṉ viṉai-vaḻi vi-p-pi taṉi-variṉ*
   Ceyvi-y-eṉ ṉ-ēva l-iṇai-y-i ṉ-īr-ēval. (Na. 138.)
2. *Muṉṉa r-ōtiya mutaṉilai y-iṟutiyiṉ*
   Vi-p-pi y-eṉpavar ṟoppatu taṉi-variṉ
   Ēval viṉai-mutaṟ ṟeriṉilai viṉaiyiṉ
   Mēvaru pakuti yām-eṉa moḻipa. (I. V. 44.)

unnecessary[1].

The author of Pirayōkavivēkam prefers the Sanskritic term *kāritam* to denote *ēval* like the author of Vīracōḻiyam and mentions, in P.V. 35, that causals are formed by adding *vi* or *pi*, and, in the commentary on the same sūtra, says that they are also formed by the doubling of the consonant of the formative. In the same place he imports the Sanskritic grammatical term *ṇijanta* and composes a small sūtra *'vippi ṇicantaṅ kāritam ākum'*. He calls the forms *āṭṭu*, *ūṭṭu*, etc. *'sahaja-ṇijanta'*. When the ordinary form like *eṭutta* is used for the casual form *eṭuppitta*, as in *'aracaṉ eṭutta-v-ālayam'*, he says it is a case of *'antarbhāvitaṇic'*.

From this it is evident that the ordinary forms of verbs are also used in causal sense. The word *'tapu'* mentioned by Iḷampūraṇar under Tol. E. 76 which means 'die or make another die' is a fitting example of this.

The introduction of the terms *ṇijanta* and *antarbhāvitaṇic* by the author of Pirayōkavivēkam in Tamil grammar does not seem to be appropriate, since the term *ṇic* denotes the causal pratyaya *i* in Sanskrit, while the causal elements in Tamil are of varied nature.

In this connection, it may be mentioned that, in the indeclinable participial forms like *koḷīi*, *niṟīi*, where the roots are *koḷ* and *nil*, the element *īi* is considered by the present day Tamil Pandits to be the elongated *ī* and to convey the causal sense. In order to determine whether it is exactly so, I give below a brief analysis of all the indeclinable participial forms found in Puṟanāṉūṟu and Pattuppāṭṭu.

Root.	Indeclinable participial form in which it appears.	No. of times in Puṟanāṉūṟu.	No. of times in Pattu-p-pāṭṭu.
(a) *ari*	*arīi* (causal)	...	1
aṟi	*aṟīi* (simple)	1	...
kaḻi	*kaḻīi* do.	...	1
kuḻi	*kuḻīi* do.	2	7
taḻi	*taḻīi* do.	9	10
	(causal)	...	2
	(passive sense)	...	1

1. *Irukāl-ēvutal kūṟiyatu kūral-ām-ākaliṉ*....(I. V. 44, Comm.)

	Root.	Indeclinable participial form in which it appears.	No. of times in Pura-nāṉūṟu.	No. of times in Pattu-p-pāṭṭu.
	paṭi	*paṭīi* (causal)	1	...
	muṭi (noun)	*muṭīi* (simple)	3	2
	muri	*murīi* do.	1	...
(b)	*iru*	*irīi* (simple)	...	1
		(causal)	2	5
	uṭu	*uṭīi* (simple)	...	3
		(causal)	...	2
	uru	*urīi* (simple)	...	2
		(causal)	...	1
	uṟu	*uṟīi* do.	1	...
	oru	*orīi* (simple)	4	1
	keḻu	*keḻīi* do.	1	4
		(causal)	...	1
	ceruku	*cerīi* (simple)	1	1
	taru	*tarīi* do.	...	5
	maru(vu)	*marīi* do.	...	1
	veru(vu)	*verīi* do.	...	5
	poru(vu)	*porīi* do.	...	1
(c)	*acai*	*acaii* do.	2	10
	aḷai	*aḷaii* do.	...	4
		(passive sense)	...	1
	urai	*uraii* (simple)	...	1
	kaṭai	*kaṭaii* do.	...	2
	kavai	*kavaii* do.	...	2
		(causal)	...	1
	kuvai	*kuvaii* do.	...	3
	kai	*kaii* (simple)	...	1
	taṭai	*taṭaii* do.	...	1
	tuḻai	*tuḻaii* (causal)	...	1
	tai	*taii* (simple)	1	1
	nacai	*nacaii* do.	1	3
	nirai	*niraii* (causal)	..	1
	nilai	*nilaii* (simple)	...	1
	niṉai	*niṉaii* do.	...	1
	muṉai	*muṉaii* do.	2	2
	vaḷai	*vaḷaii* (simple)	1	2
		(causal)	1	6
		(passive sense)	1	...

Root.	Indeclinable participial form in which it appears.	No. of times in Puṟa-nāṉūṟū.	No. of times in Pattu-p-pāṭṭū.
virai	*viraii* (simple)	2	4
	(causal)	...	1
(d) *koḷ*	*koḷīi* do.	8	7
nil	*niṟīi* do.	2	3

This list shows that *aḷapeṭai* is found in the indeclinable participles of roots ending in the vowels *i*, *u* and *ai* and in the consonants *l* and *ḷ*. It seems to me that it may occur even in roots ending in consonants other than *l* and *ḷ* since the form *uṇīi* (meaning *uṇṭū*) is found in Aiṅkuṟunūṟū. But of the roots ending in vowels only those that end in *i*, *u* or *ai* take it.

Besides, it is seen from the list that their usage as *taṉ-viṉai* or simple verbs to their usage as *piṟa-viṉai* or causal verbs is roughly in the ratio of 2 : 1. Since the active form itself is capable of giving passive sense in Tamil, we need not discuss the cases where the passive sense is conveyed in some of the examples noted above.

In the examples under (c) and (a), we should carefully consider whether the final *i* is the element showing the elongation of the previous *ai* or *ī*, or is a separate element by itself. My opinion is that it is the latter; and it is the element that is added to roots to form indeclinable participles as it is in the forms *uṟaṅki*, *pāṭi*, etc. Thus, in the forms of the roots ending in *ai* as *acaii*, *ai* is the final element of the root, and *i*, the sign of the indeclinable participle. If that be so, one may ask, whether it is not necessary to have the intervocalic *y* between *ai* and *i*. The sūtra:

Ellā moḻikku m-uyir-varu vaḻiyē
Uṭam-paṭu mey-y-i ṉ-uruvu-koḷal varaiyār.

(Tol. E. 141.)

clearly says that the insertion of the intervocalic element is only *optional*. Then what is the element in such cases that makes them causal? It is the context that makes the ordinary forms of verbs convey a causal sense.

The forms *koḷīi*, *niṟīi* of the roots ending in consonants mentioned under head (d) may have been formed thus:—*koḷ* (root) + *ī* (auxiliary verb, meaning to give) + *i* (sign of the indeclinable participle) and *nil* + *ī* + *i*. Here the root *ī* is added as an auxiliary to give causal sense. Thus *koṇṭū* means 'having taken' and *koḷīi* means 'having given to take' *i.e.* having allowed

another to take. The cases where the root *ī* is used as an auxiliary are largely found in works of Sangam period, especially in Kalittokai. (*e. g.* vantīṅku *collukuttīvāyē* (Ka. T. Vol. 2, 420.19.): *pākaṉ vantīyāṉ kol.* (Ka. T. Vol. 2, 429.10.) In these two examples, *collukuttīvāyē* and *vantīyāṉ* only mean *colluvāyē* and *vantāṉ* respectively. Though *ī* generally gives causal sense, yet here it does not denote it like the *ṇic* in the root forms *cōrayati*, etc. of the 10th conjugation in Sanskrit. That such usage is common is seen from the statement in P. V. 35 Comm. that the word *tēṟṟātavar* in the sentence *'naṭpāṭaṟēṟṟātavar'* means only *tēṟātavar* and hence *tēṟṟātavar* is a *kārita* denoting *'svārtha.'*

In this context it may be seen that other roots also like *taru varu* are largely used as auxiliaries without any special sense. (e.g.)......*tiritaru*......(Pattu. 1.1) *citaitara* (Pari. 76.48.): *tuyal-vaṟūum* (Pattu. 7.86). Besides both *ī* and *taru* are used as auxiliaries in the same word. (e. g.) *iṅku vantīttantāy* (Ka. T. Vol. 2. 583.4).

Then as regards *ī* in the forms *arīi, irīi,* etc. derived from the roots ending in *i* and *u* mentioned under (a) and (b), I may say that the auxiliary *ī* was added to them, when their final vowel disappeared.[1] In the later periods the forms *kaḻīi, uṭīi,* etc., have given place to *kaḻittu, uṭuttu*, etc. (e.g.) *kaḻittaṟ karumai-yāl* (N. 56.): *tukilum uṭuttu* (N. 264), and *urīi*, etc. to *uruvi*, etc. so that the root is now considered as *uruvu*, etc.

Again the forms with *vi* or *pi* are not found, as far as I see, in the Saṅgam works earlier than Kuṟaḷ. What could have been the reason for the introduction of *vi* or *pi?* *Pi* and *vi* in such examples as *kaḻippi* (Pattu. 236,653.) and *koḷuvi* (Pattu. 353,324) where *p* and *v* are intervocalics may have been mistaken to be similar to *pi* and *vi* in the Sanskrit forms *dāpitaḥ, māpitaḥ, sphāvitaḥ* even though *p* or *v* is considered in Sanskrit not as a causal suffix, but the element added before the causal suffix *i*, and then such forms as *kuṟaivittu* (T. 2.81.), etc. may have been used.

---

1. This point suggested itself to me in the following circumstances:—The addition of syllables to increase the quantity is allowed by Tolkāppiyaṉār in verse and also in the use of vocatives. He has nowhere said that it is used to give the sense of indeclinable participle. The insertion of intervocalic *y, v* etc. is, according to him, optional. The roots *taru, varu* and *ī* are found in large numbers as auxiliaries in the literature of the Sangam

In colloquial Tamil, words like *pāṭa-c-ceytēṉ* and *kaṭṭa-p-paṇṇiṉēṉ* are used instead of *pāṭuvittēṉ* and *kaṭṭuvittēṉ*.

The formation of double and triple causals is a peculiar development in Tamil. It is not seen in Sanskrit.

3.22222. *MOODS, VOICES AND TENSES: Teriṉilai-viṉai* has four moods, indicative, *ēval* or imperative, *viyaṅkōḷ* or optative and *eccam* or infinitive, and two voices—active affirmative and active negative—in the ancient period, and four voices —active affirmative, active negative, passive affirmative and passive negative—in the medieval and modern periods. There are three tenses in the indicative and infinitive moods, while there is only one in the imperative and the optative moods.

3.222221. *INDICATIVE MOOD* : 3.2222211 *ACTIVE AFFIRMATIVE VOICE*: The verbs in the indicative mood of the active affirmative voice denote three points;—*action, time* and *person*. The element denoting action is evidently the root like *pō, nil*, etc.; the element denoting person is the verbal termination, *aṉ, āṉ*, etc., which will shortly be dealt with in detail; the element denoting time is not mentioned by Tolkāppiyaṉār; but the fact that he recognises such an element is seen from his statement that the past tense is sometimes used for the future and so on.[1] The later grammarians like the authors of Vīracōḻiyam, Naṉṉūl, etc. make mention of them. What they are will be indicated after a detailed examination of personal terminations.

3.22222111. *PERSONAL TERMINATIONS (ANCIENT PERIOD).*

	Singular:	Plural:
1st person	*eṉ, ēṉ, al, kŭ, ṭŭ, tŭ, ṟŭ*[2]	*am, ām, em, ēm, kum, ṭum, tum, ṟum*[3].

---

period, and *i* is found as the sign of the indeclinable participles in *uṟaṅki, pāṭi* etc.

1. *Vārāk kālattu nikaḻuñ kālattum*
Ōrāṅku varūum viṉai-c-coṟ kiḷavi
Iṟanta kālattu-k kuṟippoṭu kiḷattal
Viraința poruḷa v-eṉmaṉār pulavar. (Tol Col. 241.)

2. *Ka-ṭa-ta-ṟa v-eṉṉum*
A-n-nāṉ k-ūrnta kuṉṟiya lukaramoṭu
Eṉ-ṉ-ē ṉ-al-l-eṉa varūu m-ēḻun
Taṉ-viṉai y-uraikkun taṉmai-c collē. (ibid. 203.)

3. *Avaitām*
Am-m-ā m-em-m-ē m-eṉṉuṅ kiḷaviyum
Um-m-oṭu varūuṅ ka-ṭa-ta-ṟa v-eṉṉum

	Singular :	Plural :
2nd person	*i, ai, āy, ōy*[1]	*ir, īr.*[2]
3rd person		
(a) masculine	*aṉ, āṉ, ōṉ*[3]	*ar, ār, ōr, pa* and *mār.*
(b) feminine	*aḷ, āḷ, ōḷ*	epicene plural.[4] & [5]
(c) neuter	*ṭu, tu, ṟu*[6]	*a, ā, va.* neuter plural.[7]

(MEDIEVAL & MODERN PERIODS.)

1st person	*eṉ, ēṉ, al, aṉ*	*am, ām, em, ēm, eṅkaḷ,*
	kù, ṭù, tù, ṟù[8]	*ōm, kum, ṭum, tum, ṟum.*[9]

A-n-nāṟ kiḷaviyo ṭ-ā-y-eṉ kiḷaviyum
Paṉmai y-uraikkun taṉmai-c collē. (ibid. 202.)

1. *Avaṟṟuḷ*
Muṉṉilai-k kiḷavi
I-ai āy-eṉa varūu mūṉṟum
Oppa-t tōṉṟu m-oruvarkku m-oṉṟaṟkum. (ibid. 223.)
Āy-eṉ kiḷaviyu m-avaṟṟoṭu koḷḷum. (ibid. 212.)

2. *Ir-īr miṉ-ṉ-eṉa varūu mūṉṟum*
Pallōr maruṅkiṉum palavaṟṟu maruṅkiṉuñ
Collōr-aṉaiya v-eṉmaṉār pulavar. (ibid. 224.)

3. *Aṉ-āṉ aḷ-ā ḷeṉṉu nāṉkum*
Oruvar maruṅkiṟ paṭarkkai-c collē. (ibid. 205.)

4. *Ar-ār pa-eṉa varūu mūṉṟum*
Pallōr maruṅkiṟ paṭarkkai-c collē. (ibid. 206.)
Mārai-k kiḷavi-y-um pallōr paṭarkkai
Kāla-k kiḷaviyoṭu muṭiyu m-eṉpa. (ibid. 207.)

5 *Pāl-aṟi marapi ṉ-am-mū v-īṟṟum*
Ā-v-ō v-ākuñ ceyyu ḷ-uḷḷē. (ibid. 211.)

6. *Oṉṟaṉ paṭarkkai ta-ṟa-ṭa v-ūrnta*
Kuṉṟiya lukara-t t-iṟuti y-ākum. (ibid. 217.)

7. *A-ā va-eṉa varūu m-iṟuti*
Appāṉ mūṉṟē palavaṟṟu-p paṭarkkai. (ibid. 216.)

8. *Tāy-āy-un-tīr-īruñ cāṟṟiya-tīrkaḷ-o ṭ-īrkāḷ-um-āñ*
Cāyāta muṉṉilai y-iṉ-ṉ-iṟappāṉ-taṉmai taṉ-ṉ-iṟappiṟ
Rēyāta-tēṉ-ēṉ-un tēm-ēm-un-tōm-ōm-umu m-ākum-eṉpa
Vēyār-potiyat t-akattiyaṉār-coṉṉa mey-t-tamiḻkkē.
(V. K. 6.)

Kiṟāay-niṉṟāy-kiṟīr niṉṟīr-kiṟīrkaḷ-niṉṟīrkaḷ-um-āy
Irā-niṉṟaṉa-muṉ ṉilai-y-iṉ-ṉikaḻcci y-itaṉ-kaṭṭaṉmai
Kiṟē eṉ-niṉṟēṉ-kiṟē (m) niṉṟōṅ-kiṟōm-u
niṉṟōm-um-eṉṟāṉ
Teṟā-niṉṟa-kaṭ-pava ḷan-tikaḻ-vāy-naṟ ṟīrntiḻaiyē.
(ibid. 7.)

	Singular :	Plural :	
2nd person	*i, ai, āy, ōy*	*ir, īr, īrkaḷ,*	
3rd person			
(a) masculine	*aṉ, āṉ, ōṉ*	*ar, ār, ōr,*	epicene
(b) feminine	*aḷ, āḷ. ōḷ*	*ārkaḷ, pa, mār.*	plural.
(c) neuter	*tū, ṟū*	*a* & *ā.* neuter plural.	
		(*ā* in the negative mood.)	

Eṉ and *Ēṉ*: Of these two terminations, *eṉ* is more frequently used in the ancient period than *ēṉ*, and whenever it is used, it is preceded by a cāriyai *aṉ*. (e.g.) *kaṇṭaṉeṉ* (I found) (P. N. 23.17.): *vantaṉeṉ* (I came) (P. N. 158.20.): in the later

---

Vāy-pāy-vīr-pīr-vīrkaḷ pīrkaḷ-ivai-maṉṉu muṉṉilaiyiṟ
Cāypāyviṭum-etir kālam-itaṉuḷi-t taṉmaicolliṉ
Vēy-pāvīya-toḻi vēṉ-pēṉ-vēm pēmoṭu vōm-pōm-um-āñ
Cey-pāviya-ceḻum pōti-p-pirāṉ-ṟaṉ ṟiruntuṟaikkē. (ibid.8.)
Ku-ṭu-tu-ṟu eṉṉuṅ kuṟṟiya lukaramōṭū
Al-aṉ eṉ-ēṉ āku m-īṟṟa
Iru-tiṇai mu-k-kūṟ ṟ-orumait-t taṉmai. (Na. 331.)
Am-ām eṉpaṉa muṉṉilai y-ārai--yum
Em-ēm ōm-ivai paṭarkkai y-ārai-y-um
Um-ūr ka-ṭa-ta-ṟa iru-pā l-ārai-y-um
Taṉṉoṭu paṭukkun taṉmai-p paṉmai. (ibid. 332.)
Ai-āy ikara v-īṟṟa mūṉṟum
Evaliṉ varūu m-ellā v-īṟṟavum
Muppā l-orumai muṉṉilai moḻiyē. (ibid. 335.)
Ir-īr īṟṟa iraṇṭu m-iru-tiṇaip
Paṉmai muṉṉilai miṉ-avaṟ ṟ-ēval. (ibid. 337.)
Ku-ṭu-tu-ṟū v-eṉṉuṅ kuṉṟiya lukaramo
Ṭal-l-aṉ ṉ-eṉ-ē ṉ-āku m-īṟṟa
Iru-tiṇai mu-k-kūṟ ṟ-orumai-t taṉmai-yum
Am-m-ā m-īṟṟa muṉṉilai y-ārai-y-um
Em-m-ē m-ōm-ivai paṭarkkai y-ārai-y-um
Um-m-ūr ka-ṭa-ta-ṟa v-iru-pā l-ārai-y-um
Tannoṭu paṭukkun taṉmai-p paṉmai-y-um. (I. V. 237.)
Ai-y-ā y-īkara vīṟṟa mūṉṟu
Mēvaliṉ varūu m-ellā v-īṟṟō
Ṭ-al-lā l-ēl-kā ṇ-eṉṉu m-īṟṟavum
Muppā l-orumai muṉṉilai viṉaiyum
Ir-ī r-īṟṟa v-iraṇṭu m-irutiṇai-p
Paṉmai muṉṉilai-y-u miṉṉu m-īṟṟa
Aṉṉavaṟ ṟ-ēvalu m-ām-eṉa moḻipa. (ibid. 238.)
Tāṉ-āṉ-un-tāḷ-āḷ-un tār-ārun-tārkaḷ-o ṭ-ārkaḷ-eṉṟu
Meṉām-uraitta pirattiyam-ākun tātu-v-atu-v-un

period *ēṉ* is more frequently used. (e.g.) *ukantēṉ nāṉ* (I praised) (P. T. 169.4): *niṉṉaṭāintēṉ nāṉ* (I went to you) (P. T. 169.5). These two are used in all tenses. *Eṉ* is used even without the *cāriyai*. (e.g.) *kāppeṉ* (I will protect) (Kampar. A. 232.28).

AL: The commentator on Vīracōḻiyam says that *al* is used to denote the determination of the speaker.[1] Cēṉāvaraiyar says in his commentary on the sūtra

Ka-ṭa-ta-ṟa v-eṉṉum
A-n-nāṉ k-ūrnta-kuṟṟiya l-ukaramōṭu
Eṉ-ṉ-ē ṉ-al-l-eṉa varūu m-ēḻum
Taṉ-viṉai y-uraikkum taṉmai-c-collē. (Tol. Col. 203.)

Tēṉ-ār-kuḻali taṉa-v-um-aṉa-v-un tikaḻ-paṭaṟkkai
Āṉā-v-iṟappiṟ ṟoḻiṟpatam-āṟiṟku m-āyuta-ṟiyē. (V. K. 3.)
Niṉṟāṉ kiṟāṉ-oṭu niṉṟāḷ-kiṟāḷ-ivai niṉṟār-kiṟār
Niṉṟārkaḷ-ōṭu-kiṉ ṟārkaḷu-niṉṟatuṅ kiṉṟatu-v-un
Teṉṟāta-cīr-niṉ ṟaṉa-kiṉṟaṉa-v-un tikaḻ-paṭarkkai-p
Piṉṟāṉikaḻkai toḻiṟ-patam-āṟiṟkum pērttaṟiyē. (ibid. 4.)
Vāṉ-pāṉ-um-vāḷ-pāḷ-um vār-pār-um-vār kaḷ-um pārkaḷ-uñ-cīr
Tāṉ-pāviya-v-atu v-um-patu-v-un-tattai y-attai-v-eṉṟa
Tēṉ-pāvuñ-colli vaṉa-v-um-paṉa-v-un tikaḻ-paṭarkkai
Vāṉ-pāṉ-maliyu m-etirviṟ-ṟoḻiṟpata m-āṟiṟkumē. (ibid. 5.)
Aṉ-ā ṉiṟu-moḻi āṇpāṟ paṭarkkai. (Na. 325.)
Aḷ-ā ḷ-iṟu-moḻi peṇpāṟ paṭarkkai. (ibid. 326.)
Ar-ār pa-v-v-ū r-akara mā r-īṟṟa
Pallōr paṭarkkai mār viṉai-y-oṭu muṭimē. (ibid. 327.)
Tu-ṟu-ṭu-k kuṟṟiya lukara v-īṟṟa
Oṉṟaṉ paṭaṟkkai ṭu-k kuṟippi ṉ-ākum. (ibid. 328.)
Aā v-īṟṟa palaviṉ paṭarkkai
Ā-v-ē etirmaṟaik kaṇṇa t-ākum. (ibid. 329.)
Aṉ-ṉ-ā ṉ-iru-moḻi y-āṇpāṟ paṭarkkaiyum
Aḷ-ḷ-ā ḷ-iṟu-moḻi peṇpāṟ paṭarkkaiyum
Ar-ār pa-v-v-ū r-akāra mārīṟṟa
Pallōr paṭarkkaiyum pakaru-maṉ ṉ-avaṟṟuṇ
Mārai-k kiḷavi viṉaiyoṭu muṭiyiṉum
Mēlaik kiḷaviyoṭu vēṟupā ṭiṉṟē. (I. V. 232.)
Tu-ṟu-ṭu-k kuṟṟiya lukara v-īṟṟa
Oṉṟaṉ paṭarkkaiyum a-ā vīṟṟa
Palaviṉ paṭarkkaiyum pakarumaṉ ṉ-avaṉ-uṭ
Ṭu-v-v-iṟu kiḷavi kuṟippiṟ k-ēṟṟalum
Ā-v-i ṟ-etirmaṟai-k k-ākalu m-uriya. (ibid. 234.)

1. *Tuṇivu-p-poruḷiṉ-kaṇ taṉmai-y-orumaiyil* vaṉ, paṉ *eṉṉum iraṇṭu pirattiyum-ām.* (V. K. 10, Comm.)

that *al* is preceded by *p* or *v* and is used only in verbs denoting the future tense. Naccinārkkiniyar adds in his commentary on the same sūtra that it is sometimes used in the verbs denoting present tense also as in the word *uṇṇā-niṟpal* (I eat). The author of Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam agrees with Cēṉāvaraiyar.[1] In the literature of the Sangam period, though *al* is generally used in verbs denoting future tense, yet there are instances where it is found in verbs denoting past tense also. (e.g.) *kaṇṭaṉeṉ varuval* (I came to see) (P. N. 23.17) and *uvakaiyoṭù varuval* (I came eagerly) (P. N. 165.14). But in all the instances, the *determination of the speaker* is implied. Hence the opinion of the commentator of Vīracōḻiyam seems to me to be more satisfactory. This may perhaps be the reason why Tolkāppiyaṉār has not mentioned the element that denotes tense signs and the particular terminations that are used after them.

AṈ : This is not mentioned by Tolkāppiyaṉār as a termination of the first person singular. But there are instances in Puṟanāṉūṟù *'uraittaṉaṉ yāṉ'* (I said) (P. N. 136.22.) *yāṉum... vantaṉaṉ* (even I came) (P. N. 154.7.) where *aṉ* is so used. Similar examples are found in later literature also. (e.g.) *ceykuvaṉ tavam eṉa* (that I will do penance) (M. M. 50.182.). These examples may have induced the author of Vīracōḻiyam to state that *aṉ* along with *p* or *v* as *paṉ* or *vaṉ* is the first person singular termination.[2]

The author of Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam says that *aṉ* is used in verbs denoting future tense.[3] But the example *uraittaṉaṉ* cited above denotes only past tense. Hence the opinion of the author of Vīracōḻiyam seems to me to be more satisfactory.

WHAT MAY BE THE ORIGIN OF THIS AṈ ? This may be identical with *aṉ* of the third person singular masculine. Since there is sometimes a tendency to use third person to denote the speaker himself possibly out of modesty, this may have been originally used to denote first person in *sense* though, in *form*, it may have been taken as third person singular masculine, and afterwards the form itself may have been mistaken for that

1. *Uṇpal, varuval eṉa varum al-l-īṟṟu-t ; taṉmai-y-orumai-muṟṟu-c-collum*. . . .etirkālam-paṟṟi *varum*. (I. V. 237, Comm.)

2. *Taṉmai-t-tuṇivā m-orumai-vaṉ-paṉa*. . . . (V. K. 10.)

3. *Kūṟuvaṉ eṉa varum aṉ-ṉ-īṟṟut taṉmai-y-orumai-muṟṟu-c-collum* etirkālam-*paṟṟivarum*. (I. V. 237, Comm.)

of the first person. Or the third personal termination *aṉ* itself may have been used originally both for the third and the first person at the beginning of the formation of the language and these instances may be the survivals of such pre-historic usage; for, if we observe the growth of language in children, it is seen that it takes a long time for them to grasp the idea of 'I' and so they generally refer to themselves only in the third person. Or *al* mentioned above may have been metamorphosed into *aṉ* as the case-suffies *āṉ* and *iṉ* to *āl* and *il* respectively. cf. 3.213233 and 3.213234 *supra.*

Kù, Ṭù, Tù, Ṟù : Of these four *ṭù*, *tù* and *ṟù* belong not only to the first person singular, but also to the third person neuter. Wherever these are used, they are not preceded by the tense signs unlike the terminations *eṉ*, *ēṉ*, etc. Hence it seems to me that these forms may have come into existence by cutting off *ēṉ*, *āṉ*, *ār*, etc. from *uṇṭēṉ*, *tantēṉ*, *ceṉṟēṉ*, *uṇṭāṉ*, *tantāṉ*, *ceṉṟāṉ*, *uṇṭār*, *tantār*, *ceṉṟār*, etc. as in Malayāḷam, since the meaning of *ēṉ*, *āṉ*, and *āṟ* are expressed by their subjects *yāṉ* or *nāṉ*, *avaṉ* and *avar* respectively and may have been at some time used in all the persons and numbers, but later on restricted to the first person singular and the third person neuter singular. Similarly the form *uṇkù* may have been evolved out of *uṇkēṉ* and may have been restricted to the first person singular.

Iḷampūraṇar thinks that the forms *uṇkù*, *uṇṭù*, *vantù* and *cēṟù* (Tol. Col. 203, Iḷam.) are used only in the future tense. Naṉṉūlār says in Na. 145 that *ṟù* and *tù* denote the past and the future, *ṭù*, the past and *kù*, the future tense. Cēṉāvaraiyar agrees with Iḷampūraṇar. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar states with caution that all the four *mostly* denote the future tense. The author of Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam agrees with Iḷampūraṇar. (I. V. 50.)

Am, Ām, Em, Ēm, Ēṅkaḷ, Ōm: Of these, the first four are generally used in all periods, while the fifth, which is evidently a double plural termination, in the medieval period and the last in the medieval and modern periods. *Ōm* may have sprung from *ām* by changing *ā* to *ō* through analogy with the formations *vantōṉ*, *vantōḷ*, *vantōr* and *vantōy*.

The following may serve as examples for most of the terminations mentioned above:—*uṇkuvam* (we will eat) (P. N. 136,26.): *ēttukam* (we will praise) (P. N. 161,32,): *kūṟuvām* (we will narrate) (Kampar. B. 26,1.): *uṭai-y-ēm* (we have) (P. N.

112,2): *uṉṭēṅkaḷ* (we ate) (C. C. 1795.): *tantōm* (we gave) *vēṇṭōm* (we do not pray for) (P. T. 195, 5).

These terminations are like *eṉ*, *ēṉ*, etc. preceded by the tense signs.

Iḷampūraṇar, Cēṉāvaraiyar and Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar mention that *ām* and *ōm* are used when the subject denotes the speaker and the person spoken to, or the speaker, the person spoken to and a third person, and *em* and *ēm* when it denotes the speaker and a third party.[1] Naṉṉūlār says the same, but adds *ōm* also to the latter list.[2] The author of Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam agrees with Naṉṉūlār.[3] The author of Vīracōḻiyam mentions only *ēm* and *ōm*. The following may serve as examples for the same :—

Payil pūntaṉṭalai-p-paṭarkuvam (Cilap. 258,67.); here *paṭarkuvam* means 'let her, you and me go'.

Ēval ceytuṇaivarēm yāṅkaḷ (Kampar. K. 175.14,) ; here *ēval-ceytuṇaivarēm* means 'let me and others serve you'.

Varikku-k-kūṟu ceyvārkaḷukkum coṉṉōm (S. I. I. iii, i, 44-5); here *coṉṉōm* does not include the person spoken to.

In colloquial speech of the modern days, only the terminations *ōm* and *ēṅga* or *ēṅgō*, the modified forms of *ēṅkaḷ* are used. *Ēṅga* or *ēṅgō* are used only by uneducated people. M. J. Vinson mentions only the latter form. (J. A. Dixie Serie Tome 17, p. 189.)

Kum, Ṭum, Tum, Ṟum: Whatever is said of *kù*, *ṭù*, *tù*, and *ṟù* applies to these four. Evidently, these are formed from *kù*, *ṭù*, *tù* and *ṟù* by the addition of the pluralising particle *m*; (e.g.) *kāraṇaṅ kūṟutum* (we shall state the reasons) (T. 3.3).

I, ai, āy, ōy: Of these terminations, *i* and *ai* are more frequently used in the ancient period, while *āy* in the later periods; the form *ōy* is generally used in literature. In colloquial speech only the termination *āy* is now frequently used. (e.g.) *varaiti*

---

1. *Am ām eṉpaṉa* munniṉṟārai *uḷappaṭukkum; tamar-āya-vaḻi* paṭarkkai-y-ārai-y-um *uḷappaṭukkum. Em ēm eṉpaṉa* paṭarkkaiyārai *uḷappaṭukkum.* (Tol. Col. 202, Ceṉā.)

2. *Am-ām eṉpaṉa* muṉṉilai y-āraiyum
Em-ēm ōm-ivai paṭarkkai y-āraiyum. (Na. 332.)

3. . . . .
Am-m-ā mīṟṟa muṉṉilai y-āraiyum
Em-m-ē m-ōm-ivai paṭarkkai y-āraiyum. . . . (I. V. 237.)

(you classify) (P. N. 8,8): *varuti* (you come) (P.N. 8.8.): *paṭiyiṉai* (you made them rest) (P.N. 15.10.): *eri ūṭṭiṉai* (you set fires (P.N. 16,17.): *ollāy* (you will not desire) (P. N. 31.6.): *ūtāy* (you will blow) (P.T. 160.6 to 10.): *koṭuttōy* (you gave) (P.N. 2,16). [The author of Vīracōḻiyam mentions only *āy*.]

Ir, īr, īrkaḷ: *Ir* and *īr* are generally used in the literature of all periods. In the medieval and modern periods, the double plural terminations began to be used. (e. g.) *celkuvīr* (you will go) (Cilap. 295,91.): *paṭarīr* (you traverse) (Cilap. 295,87.): *vantīrkaḷ* (you have come) (*colloq.*) *ir* is practically extinct. [The author of Vīracōḻiyam mentions only *īr* and *īrkaḷ*.] In the colloquial speech at the present day, *īr* is used in the honorific singular alone and *īrkaḷ*, *īṅga* and *īṅgō* are used in honorific singular and plural. The forms *īṅga* and *īṅgō* are used only by uneducated people. They are evidently the modified forms of *īrkaḷ*. The substitution of *ṅ* for *r* may be due to the principle of economy of effort, since it is easier to pronounce *ṅ* before *g* than *r*; or it may be through analogy with *ṅ* in *vantēṅga* or *vantēṅgō*. The latter form is mentioned by M. J. Vinson. (J. A. Dixieme Series, Tome 17, p. 189.)

Aṉ, āṉ, ōṉ: *Aṉ* is generally preceded by the *cāriyai aṉ* as *aṭṭaṉaṉ* (he killed) (P.N. 78,12). But it is used by itself after the roots (*uḷ, il*, etc.) (e.g.) *uḷaṉ* (he is) (P.N. 86,3). *Ōṉ* is used only in literature. (e.g.) *urantaiyōṉē* (he belongs to *urantai* (P.N. 68,18.) [The author of Vīracōḻiyam mentions only *āṉ*. (V.K. 3,4, etc.)] but the later grammarians follow Tolkāppiyaṉār. In colloquial Tamil only *āṉ* is used.

Aḷ, āḷ, ōḷ: Whatever has been said about *aṉ, āṉ* and *ōṉ* holds good for *aḷ, āḷ*, and *ōḷ*. (e. g.) *aḻutaṉaḷ* (she bewailed) (P. N. 143.15). [The author of Viracōḻiyam mentions only *āḷ*] but the later grammarians follow Tolkāppiyaṉār.

Ar, ār, ōr, pa, mār, ārkaḷ: The first five are used in all periods, while the last is found only in the medieval and modern periods. *Ōr* is used only in literature. *Ārkaḷ* is evidently a double plural termination. As regards *mār*, I quite agree with M. J. Vinson that it is also a case of double plural termination. (J. A. Dixieme Serie Tome, 17, p. 189.) Verbal forms with *ārkaḷ* are very frequently used in Tēvāram and Nālāyirappirapantam. (e.g.) *pukaḻvārkaḷ* (they will praise) (T. 32,9). Hence it seems to be that the author of Vīracōḻiyam

has mentioned *ārkaḷ* side by side with *ār*. But it is difficult to understand why he has not mentioned the terminations *ar*, *ōr*, *pa* and *mār*. The other grammarians have followed Tolkāppiyaṉār. In the colloquial speech of the present day, the termination *ār* is used in honorific singular and *ārkaḷ* both in honorific singular and plural. Uneducated people use *āṅga* and *āṅgō*, the modified forms of *ārkaḷ*. They may have had the same origin as *īṅga* or *īṅgō*.

Tù, ṟù: Naṉṉūlār states that *tù* and *ṟù* denote the past and the future tense.[1] Cēṉāvaraiyar's opinion is that *tù* is used after the sign of all the three tenses, and *ṟù* after that of the past.[2] Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar agrees with the latter.[3] [*Ṭù* is not included here since Cēṉāvaraiyar and Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar think that it is used only in the appellative verbs.]

A, ā, va: Whenever *a* is used, it is generally preceded by the cāriyai *aṉ*. (e. g.) *paraintaṉa* (they have been scraped, (P.N. 4.3); *maruppu-p-pōṉṟaṉa* (they are like horns (P.N. 4,4.); but there are examples where it is used without it. (e. g.) *tōṉṟuva* (they will appear) (P. N. 4.5). *Ā* is used in the negative sense. Tolkāppiyaṉār himself has used it so. (e.g.) *uyirmey allaṉa moḻimuta lākā* (Tol. E. 60); but he has not expressly stated in any of his sūtras that it has negative sense. Naṉṉūlār, seems to be the first grammarian to mention it,[4] and the author of Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam follows him.[5]

[The author of Vīṟacōḻiyam mentions *aṉa* which evidently shows that he takes the termination and the cāriyai *aṉ* together as termination. He does not mention *ā* or *va*.]

A NOTE ON *KAḶ* in *EṄKAḶ, ĪRKAḶ, ĀRKAḶ* : According to Tolkāppiyaṉār, *kaḷ* is optionally used as the pluralising

1. Ra-v-v-o ṭu-kara v-ummai-nikaḻ p-allavum
Ta-v--o ṭ-iṟappu m-etirvum.... (Na. 145.)
2. Takara-v-ukaram mūṉṟu-kālattiṟkum urittù;
Rakara-v-ukaram iṟanta-kālattiṟku urittù.
(Tol. Col. 217, Cēṉā.)
3. *Ibid.* (Tol. Col. 217, Nac.)
4. *Aā īṟṟa palaviṉ paṭarkkai*
Ā-v-ē etir-maṟai-k *kaṇṇa tākum*. (Na. 329.)
5. *Ṭuṟu-tu-k kuṟṟiya lukara v-īṟṟa*
Oṉṟaṉ paṭarkkaiyum a-ā v-īṟṟa
Ā-v-ī ṟ-etir-maṟai-k *k-ākalu m-uriya*. (T. V. 234.)

particle of *aḵṟiṇai* nouns. Its use may have subsequently been extended to *uyartiṇai* nouns also. (e.g.) *maṉitarkaḷ* (men). In such cases it is added mostly to plural forms, thus making them double plurals. Verbal forms like *pōṉār* may be used as nouns also in Tamil in the sense of persons who went, and declined as *pōṉārai, pōṉāroṭu*, etc. To the latter type of forms like *pōṉār*, *kaḷ* may have been added and thus forms like *pōṉārkaḷ* may have come into being, in the sense of persons who went. (e.g.) *col-mālai colluvārkaḷ...neṭuṅkālam vāḻvārē* (those who compose songs will live for a long time) (P. T. 135. 10); here *colluvārkaḷ* means those who will say. Such forms were, perhaps, through confusion, treated as verbs. From such instances, *kaḷ* should have become generalised as a pluralising particle in verbs also. Thus *pōṉārkaḷ, pōṉīrkaḷ*, etc. are cases of double plurals. Double plurals of this kind are found frequently used in Tēvāram and Nālāyirappirapantam, the literature written between the the 6th and 8th centuries A.D. But in the later literature they are not so frequent.

Here it would be very useful to bear in mind that ancient Canarese *gaḷ* and modern Canarese *gaḷu* which correspond to Tamil *kaḷ* are not used in Canarese verbs and that likewise Telugu *lu* (=Tamil *kaḷ*) is not used in Telugu verbs.[1] It would not be difficult to infer from this that the use of *kaḷ* as a pluralizing particle of verbs should have been developed as a special feature of Tamil during the course of its separate development, and that, prior to its separation from Telugu and Canarese, during what might be called the primitive Dravidian period, *kaḷ* did not find any place in the *formation of verbs*. It would also be interesting to observe that Canarese *gaḷ* or *gaḷu* and Telugu *lu* which correspond to Tamil *kaḷ* are occasionally used as the plural suffix in Cauarese and Telugu, of rational nouns and pronouns[2] corresponding to *uyartiṇai* nouns and pronouns in Tamil, and that, in Cilappatikāram for the first time, the form *yāṅkaḷ* occurs with *kaḷ* in *uyartiṇai*, though no verbal form with *kaḷ* is found there. Such *verbal forms* with *kaḷ* are found for the first time in the works of the 6th, 7th and 8th centuries A. D. like Tēvāram, and Nālāyirappirapantam. This induces me to suggest that Canarese Telugu and Tamil may have been separated from one another

1. C. D. G. pp. 555 to 563.
2. *Ibid.* 224.

between the age of Cilappatikāram (5th cent. A.D. circa.) and the age of Tēvāram and Nālāyirappirapantam (6th to 8th cent. A.D.).

IMITATION OF PĀṆINI BY THE AUTHORS OF VĪRACŌLIYAM AND PIRAYŌKAVIVĒKAM: The author of Vīracōḻiyam does not mention the verbal terminations separately but mentions them along with tense elements as *tāṉ, tāḷ, niṉṟāṉ, kiṟāṉ, kiṟāy, kiṟēṉ*, etc. He has done so, perhaps because he thought that they should correspond to *ti, si, mi*, etc. the terminations in Sanskrit, which generally denote both tense and person.

The author of Pirayōkavivēkam has gone too far in importing unnecessarily the terms *atmanēpada* and *parasmaipada* and explaining them with reference to the Tamil terminations. He states that *parappaipatam* (*parasmaipada*) is used at the end of finite verbs in *kartari* or active voice, the *taṅ* or *āṟpaṉēpatam* (*ātmanēpada*) is used in *kartari* or active voice, *karmaṇi* or passive voice or *bhāvē* or impersonal form. According to him *parappaipatam* is the termination which ends in a short vowel or has a penultimate short vowel. (e.g.) *kū, aṉ, aḷ, ar*, etc.; *āṟpaṉēpatam* is that which ends in a long vowel or has a penultimate long vowel. (e.g.) *mār, ai, āy*, etc. Both the above terminations are *āṟpaṉēpatam* when they are used in the passive voice. The roots which take both the above terminations are called *upayapati* (*ubhayapadi*). Thus the root *camai* (to cook) which has forms *camaikkiṉṟaṉaṉ*, (he cooks) *camaippāṉ*. (he will cook) *camaikkiṉṟilaṉ*, (he does not cook) *camaikkiṉṟāṉ*, (he cooks) *camaippāṉ*, (he will cook) *camaiyāṉ* (he will not cook) is *upayapati*; the root *uṇ* with reference to the forms *uṇkiṟāṉ uṇmār, uṇṭaṉai uṇṭāy* is *ēkapati* in *āṟpaṉēpatam* and the same root with reference to the forms *uṇkū, uṇṭū*, etc. is *ēkapati* in *parappaipatam*.

It is clear that this classification of terminations is quite against the nature of Tamil language and is done solely in imitation of Sanskrit Grammar. Even here it may be noted that in Sanskrit, if a root takes *ātmanēpada* terminations, it takes them in all persons in its conjugation in one tense or mood. (e.g.) *karōmi, karōṣi* and *karōti* in the singular of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd persons present, respectively; but in Tamil, *uṇṭū*, the first person singular past tense, is *parappaipatam, uṇṭāy*, the 2nd person singular in the same tense is *āṟpanēpatam* and *uṇṭū*, the 3rd person neuter singular in the same tense is *parappaipatam*. Besides, he says that the verbal form '*camaikkiṉṟaṉaṉ*' is used when one cooks for

another and *camaikkinrāṉ* is used when one cooks for himself. Nowhere else is it said so; nor do I see any example in literature in support of this distinction.

Besides, he mentions that the form '*cāttaṉāl varappaṭum*' as an example for *bhāvēprayōga*. This is exactly the translation of the Sanskrit sentence '*cāttēna āgamyatē*'. Such a sentence, though made up of Tamil words does not seem to me to be a Tamil sentence.[1] His importation of *bhāvēprayōga* too is most inappropriate.

Another most curious point mentioned by him is that '*a*' following '*ṉ*' in the form *uṇṇappaṭum*, '*ā*' following '*ṉ*' in *uṇṇāniṉṟāṉ*, '*u*' following '*l*' in *colluka*, '*ī*' following '*ṟ*' in *veṉṟīka*, *ta* in *pukutaka*, *tai* in *irintaikka*, *ku* in *aṟaikuvaṉ* are *conjugational signs*.[2] Is this not in direct imitation of Sanskrit?

By the way he mentions that he has imported the Sanskritic terms *tiṅ* and *taṅ* in Tamil to make up for the want of Tamil words ending in '*ṅ*'.[3] By such importation he does more harm than good. The terms *tiṅ* and *taṅ* may be quite intelligible in Sanskrit grammar, but, in Tamil, they are not so, since the Tamil grammarians have not resorted to the devise of using *pratyāhāra* as in Sanskrit.

3.22222112. *TENSE AND TENSE-SIGNS:*—Tolkāppiyaṉār says that there are three tenses past, present and future.[4] He does not mention any suffix denoting tense. This fact is noticed by the commentators Cēṉāvaraiyar and Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar and they make mention of the same under the last sūtra of Collatikāram in Tolkāppiyam. But at the same time Tolkāppiyaṉār mentions that the past tense is used to denote either the present or the future when such actions take place immediately,[5] and that the past and the present tenses are used to denote the

---

1. P. V. 36 & its comm.
2. P. V. 41, comm.
3. P. V. 36, comm.
4. *Kālan tāmē mūṉṟeṉa moḻipa.* (Tol. Col. 199.)
   Iṟappi ṉikaḻvi ṉ-etirvi ṉ-eṉṟā
   A-m-mu-k kālamuṅ kuṟippotuṅ koḷḷum
   Mey-n-nilai y-uṭaiya tōṉṟa l-āṟē (ibid. 200.)
5. *Vārā-k kālattu nikaḻuṅ kālattum*
   Or-āṅkū varūum viṉai-c-coṟ kiḷavi
   Iṟanta kālattu-k kuṟippotu kiḷattal
   Virainta poruḷa v-eṉmaṉār pulavar. (ibid. 241.)

future for the sake of clearness.[1] If distinct tense formations were definitely current in Tolkāppiyaṉār's time, it would be difficult to account for his omission to deal with the distinctive signs for such formations. He mentions, however, three tenses and adds that one may be used for another under certain circumstances as stated above. It is impossible to see how he could speak of one tense form being used for another if it were true that in his days tense formations were not at all differentiated on the morphological side. I am inclined to suggest a solution for this difficulty. It may not be unreasonable to suppose that perhaps, Tolkāppiyaṉār was only thinking of different *tense-values* when he mentioned three tenses; that some of his contemporaries may have begun to associate particular *verbal forms* with particular tense values through the frequency of particular use; and that, with reference to such forms, Tolkāppiyaṉār was probably indicating the circumstances under which overlapping in tense values might be recognised.

The author of Vīracōḻiyam states that *ta*, *ṉa* and *ya* are added to roots to form the past participle, *kiṟa*, *āniṉṟa* and *cu* to form the present participle and *kum*, *um*, *m*, to form the future participle.[2] Its commentator gives the following as examples under the same stanza for the past participles:—*piṟanta*, *pōṉa* and *āya*.

The author of Naṉṉūl seems to have analysed the above into *t* and *a*, *kiṟu* and *a*, etc. where *t*, *kiṟu*, etc. were taken as tense signs and *a*, the participial sign. According to him, *ṭ*, *t*, *ṟ* and *iṉ* denote the past tense, *kiṟu*, *kiṉṟu* and *āniṉṟu* denote the present tense and *pa* and *va* denote the future, *ṟù* and *ṟum*, and *tù* and *tum* denote the past and the future, *ṭù* and *ṭum* denote the past, *kù* and *kum* denote the future, *i* and *mār* denote the future, *pa* the past and the future, *um* the present and the future[3]. Here it

---

1. *Vārā-k kālattu viṉai-c-coṟ kiḷavi*
Iṟappiṉu nikaḻviṉuñ ciṟappa-t tōṉṟum
Iyaṟkai-y-un teḷivuṅ kiḷakkuṅ kālai. (ibid. 245.)

2. *Tātu-v-iṉ-piṉpù ta-ṉa-ya-v-iṟappi ṉikaṭci-y-id-kaṉ*
Otuṅ-kiṟa-cū-v-o ṭ-āniṉṟa-v-āṉ-kum-m-um m-ōṭu-ma ∴ kāṉ
Pētamaliyu m-etirin-kaṉ-ākum piṟavum-vantāl
Etan-il-catiran tam-piḻaiyāma l-iya-ṟṟi-k-koḷḷē. (V Tāt. 7.)

3. *Ta-ṭa-ṟa-v-oṟ r-in-ṟ-ē y-aim-pāl mū-v-iṭattù*
Iṟanta kālan tarun-toḻi l-iṭai-nilai. (Na. 142.)

must be noted that the verbal terminations *kŭ, ṭŭ, tŭ, ṟu, kum, ṭum, tum, ṟum* are taken to denote not only the person and the number, but also the tense.

Since *t* becomes *ṭ* and *ṟ* respectively after *ḷ* and *ṉ*, and *l* and *ṉ*, *ṭ* and *ṟ* may be regarded as the modification of *t* itself; and hence it seems to me that it would have been sufficient if Naṉnūlār had mentioned only *t* and *iṉ* as past tense signs.

ORIGIN OF THE TENSE SIGN 'IṈ':—The tense sign '*iṉ*' comes after the roots ending in *ŭ*. It seems to me that the final *ŭ* of the roots was changed to *i* before *y*[1] so that the forms *aṭakkiya* (P. N. 6. 25.) were formed. The roots like *pō* took only *ṉ* as the past tense sign so that the form *pōṉāṉ* was current. Later on the forms like *aṭakkiya* gave place to those like *aṭakkiṉa* so that '*iṉ*' began to be considered as the past tense sign. In the indeclinable participle *i* alone is added in such cases to represent the past tense as *aṭakki, uṟaṅki*, etc. Thus '*i*' which was originally the modified form of *ŭ* in sandhi may have come to be regarded as a part of the past tense sign.

Besides, there are a few roots in Tamil, as Dr. Caldwell says, which formed their past tense in the ancient period without the addition of any tense sign, but by the reduplication of the final consonant. (e.g.) *pukkaṉar* (they entered) (Cilap. 342, 196). But even in the ancient period such forms began generally to be superseded by the more regular forms formed by adding tense to roots. (e.g.) *pukuntu* (Cilap. 574, 14).

As regards the future tense, it seems to me that it may have been in its origin later than the past, for it is possible for the primitive people to remember some of their past deeds and express them to others before they begin to think of the future.

Āniṉṟŭ kiṉṟŭ kiṟ-mū v-iṭattiṉ
Aim-pāl nikaḻ-poḻu t-aṟai-viṉai y-iṭai-nilai. (ibid. 143.)
Pa-v-va mū-v-iṭat t-ai-m-pā l-etir-poḻutŭ
Icai-viṉai y-iṭai-nilai y-ām-ivai cila-v-ila. (ibid. 144.)
Ra-v-v-o ṭukara v-ummai-nikaḻ p-alla-vum
Ta-v-v-o t-iṟappu m-etirvum ṭa-v-v-otŭ
Kaḻivum ka-v-v-ō ṭ-etirvum-miṉ ṉ-ēval
Viyaṅkō ḷ-i-m-mā retirvum pāntam
Celavoṭŭ varavum ceyyu-nikaḻ p-etirvum
Etir-maṟai mummai-yu m-ēṟku m-īṅkē. (ibid. 145.)

1. *Yakaram varu-vaḻi y-ikaran kuṟukum*
Ukara-k kiḷavi tuvara-t tōṉṟātŭ. (Tol. E. 411.)

This is clearly seen in the case of children. The only future that would have been possible then was that conveyed by the command which is expressed by the imperative second person.

The present tense may, in all probability, have been the last in the formation, since it is not quite necessary on the part of a speaker to express to another what is actually happening since he himself is witnessing it. The present tense forms in Tamil with the signs *kiṉṟu*, *āniṉṟu*, etc. are almost absent in the works of Sangam period. I was able to find out one form *cērkiṉṟa* in Paripāṭal (p. 163, 35). Such forms are very frequent only in the literature of the medieval period. (e.g.) *eṉkiṉṟāḷ* in each of 10 stanzas in Tēvāram, pp. 25 and 26; *eṉkiṉṟāḷāl* in Periyatirumoḻi of Nālāyirappirapantam, pp. 154 and 155; *cellāniṉṟa āṇṭu* (T. A. S. i, 14); *paṟṟāniṉṟārai* (T. 1. 51).

The forms *uṇkiṟāṉ*, *uṇkiṉṟāṉ*, *uṇṇāniṉṟāṉ*, *uṇṇākiṭantāṉ*, *uṇṇāviruntāṉ* appear to me to have been two words which were, later on, mistaken for one; for the commentator on Vīracōḻiyam says that the forms *niṉṟāṉ*, *kiṭantāṉ*, *iruntāṉ*, etc., are derived from the roots *nil*, *kiṭa*, *iru*, etc. and are used as the personal terminations after roots in the present tense.[1] Cēṉāvaraiyar, a commentator on Tolkāppiyam repeats the same thing. Hence *uṇṇā* and *niṉṟāṉ* were, at one time, two words of which *uṇṇā* was a participle (modified form of *uṇṇū*) and *niṉṟāṉ* was the finite verb. This may be seen from the following two examples:— *iravā niṉṟāṉ* (Kampar. A. 239. 38.); *tēṟṟā niṉṟāṉ* (Kampar. A. 249. 52.) where *iravā* and *tēṟṟā* are affirmative indeclinable participles. Later on *nil* of *niṉṟāṉ* in *uṇṇāniṉṟāṉ* began to be taken as an auxiliary verb. *Uṇṇāniṉṟāṉ* should have originally meant 'he is eating', the past tense *niṉṟāṉ* being used to denote the immediateness of the action. The above explanation holds good for the forms *uṇṇāniṉṟāṉ*, *uṇṇākiṭantāṉ* and *uṇṇāviruntāṉ*. But what should have been the origin of *uṇkiṟāṉ* and *uṇkiṉṟāṉ*? The form *uṇkiṟēṉ* which is very often used in colloquial speech is said to be the later form by Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar[2] and it is not generally found in Tamil classics up to 12th century. Hence it may be considered to have been the modified form of

1. *Nil eṉṉun tātuviṉiṉṟu iṟanta-kāla-p-paṭar-kkaiyil niṉṟāṉ mutaliya pirattiyayaṅkaḷ nikaḻ-kāla-p-poruḷil varum.* (V. K. 4, comm.)

2. *Uṇkiṟēṉ-eṉa-k kiṟu eṉpatu nikaḻkālam uṇarttutal* i-k-kāla-vaḻakkū. (Tol. Col. 202, Nac.)

uṇkiṉṟāṉ. The form *ākiṉṟù* as the finite verb is found in the following lines of Puṟanāṉūṟù:—

Peṇṇuruvu oru-tiṟaṉ ākiṉṟù (the form of a woman is on one side). (P.N. 1.7.)

Pirai-nutal vaṇṇam-ā kiṉṟù (crescent forms a source of beauty to the forehead). (P.N. 1.9.)

This may have been formed from *ā* (root) + *ku* (cāriyai) + *iṉ* (cāriyai) + *ṟù* (the neuter sign termination). Could *ākiṉṟāṉ* have been formed by adding *āṉ* to *ākiṉṟù* mistaking it to be the indeclinable participle? Or as Dr. Graul, Dr. Gundert and M. J. Vinson opine, *kiṉṟù* may have been formed from *k* a sign of the future in Tamil and *iṉṟù* meaning now.[1]

The author of Naṉṉūl plainly says that *kiṟù* and *kiṉṟù* and *āniṉṟù* are the present tense signs, though *k* of *kiṟù* and *kiṉṟù* in forms like *uṇkiṟāṉ* and *uṇkiṉṟāṉ* is the final element of the previous word, like *uṇku*, and *iṟu* is the initial element of the following word, and *ā* of *āniṉṟù* in the form like *uṇṇāniṉṟaṉ* is the final element of the affirmative indeclinable participles like *uṇṇā*, and *niṉṟù* is the initial element of *niṉṟāṉ*.

In modern times, the past perfect, the present perfect and the future perfect are used with a past participle and the finite verbal form in the past, present and future of the root *iru*. e. g. *ceytù iruntāṉ* (he had done), *ceytirukkiṉṟāṉ* (he has done), *ceytù iruppāṉ* (he would have done). Similarly, the forms of the past perfect continuous, the present perfect continuous and the future perfect continuous are also found. e.g. *ceytukoṇṭiruntāṉ*, *ceytukoṇṭirukkiṉṟāṉ*, *ceytukoṇṭiruppāṉ*.

The past and the future tenses may respectively correspond to the aorist and the second future in Sanskrit. The causal verbs also are used in all the three tenses in the same way as simple verbs. The latter is formed by adding to the root, the tense sign and the personal termination, while the former by adding to the root, the causal suffix *vi* or *pi*, the tense sign and the personal terminations or by adding the tense sign and the personal terminations to the causal form of the root as *ākkù*, *tiruttù*, etc.

3.2222212. *ACTIVE NEGATIVE VOICE*: Tolkāppiyaṉār has hinted about the active negative voice in his statement

1. C. D. G. 494 and J. A. Onzieme Serie Tome XIII, p. 116.

that case-suffixes will be used even after nouns qualifying a negative verb,[1] and also has mentioned the term *etirmaṟai* in the sūtra

Ecca v-ummai-y-u m-etirmaṟai y-ummai-y-um
Tattam-uṇ mayaṅku m-uṭaṉilai y-ilavē.
(Tol. Col. 283.)

From the literature of the Sangam and medieval periods we may infer that the negation was expressed in six ways:—

(1) By inserting the negative particle *al* between the root and the personal termination.

e. g. *cel-l-al-am* (we will not go). (P.N. 101.1.)
aṟi-y-al-aṉ (he does not know). (P.N. 239.9.)

(2) By inserting the negative particle *al* or *il* between the tense sign and the personal termination.

e. g. *ciṟantaṉṟŭ* (it is not desirable). (P.N. 75.5.)
urai-t-t-il-aṉ (he did not say). (P.T. 205.12.)
kaṇ-ṭ-il-ēṉ (I have not seen). (P.T. 202.2.)

(3) By inserting *il* followed by the personal terminations after the affirmative finite forms of verbs.

(e.g.) *muyaṅkiṉēṉ-allēṉ* (I was not befooled). (P.N. 19.7.)
celvēm allēm (we will not go). (P.N. 36.11)
ollāṉ allaṉ (he will not agree). (P.N. 97.21.)
peruvār-alar (they will not receive). (P.T. 200.5.)

(4) By inserting the vowel *ā* between the root and the tense sign. (This is seen clearly in the third person neuter singular.)

(e.g.) *ākātŭ* (it will not become). (Tol. E. 71.)
mutalātŭ (it will not commence). (Tol. E. 65.)
pēṇātŭ (it will not agree). (T. 2.6.)

(5) By adding the personal terminations directly to the root.

(e.g.) *kāṇēṉ* (I will not see). (P.N. 71.5.)
ollāy (you will not agree). (P.N. 31.6.)
ollāṉ (he will not agree). (P.N. 78.9.)
vaiyārkaḷē (They will not despise).(P.T. 204.10.)

---

1. *Etir-maṟuttu moḻi-y-iṉ-un tatta marapiṟ*
Poruṇilai tiriyā vēṟṟumai-c collē. (Tol. col. 107.)

(6) By lengthening the *a* of roots like *var*[1] and adding the personal terminations.

(e.g.) *vārēm* (we will not come). (P.N. 145.4.)

The author of Vīracōḻiyam states that *āṉ, āḷ, ār, ārkaḷ, atù, ā, ilaṉ, ilaḷ, ilar, ilarkaḷ, ilatù, ila* and others like *atōḷi* are added after roots to denote *taṭai-p-poruḷ* or negative meaning.[2] Its commentator adds that the verbs having the first six terminations denote the future tense, and the verbs having the next six denote the past tense when they (*ilaṉ*, etc.) are preceded by *t*, as in *naṭantilaṉ*, and the present tense when they are preceded by *k*, as in *naṭakkilaṉ*. But I am at a loss to know why he did not add the first and the second personal terminations along with the first six and *alēṉ, alai, alaṉ, alar*, etc. along with the next six.

The authors of Naṉṉūl and Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam have stated about the negative voice only with respect to *ā*, the termination of the neuter plural. It is the Rev. C. J. Beschi who has definitely stated that in *maṟai-viṉai* personal terminations are *directly* added to roots without any tense sign between them and that *ātù* is the termination that is added to the root in the third person neuter singular.

At present we have certain forms of verbs which are common both to affirmative and negative voices, *ceyyāy* and *ceyyīr*, the second person singular and plural forms respectively. The indeclinable participles *ceyyā, uṇṇā* also come under that category.

The author of Ilakkaṇakkottù gives the following examples to illustrate the identity of *viti* or affirmative form and *maṟai* or negative form. (e.g.) *vallār tirai koṭuppar* (the weak will pay tribute), *vallār tiṟai koḷvar* (the strong will take tribute), *aruḷāṉ* (one who has the favour or one who has not the favour),

---

1. it seems to me that the root in *varukiṉṟāṉ* and *varuvāṉ* was originally *var*, though in modern times *vā* is taken to be the root. cf. Tel. *rā* (come.)

2. *Āṉ-āḷ-ār-ārkaḷ-oṭ-ātu-ā-v-ilaṉ-maṟṟ-ilaḷ-ilar-um*
Tāṉ-ām-ilarka ḷ-ilatù-ila-tātù-t taṭai-p-poruṭ-kaṉ
Mēṉām-uraitta marapē-varumikka vātoḷi-muṉ
Nānāvuḷamaṟṟù naṟṟaṭai-maṉṉum pira-ttiyamē.

(V. Tat. 11.)

vekuḷāṉ (one who is irritable or one who is not irritable).[1] C. J. Beschi says *nōvāṉ* is common to both (It means, he won't suffer or he will suffer). Similarly one of the commentators on Naṉṉūl says that *cāvāṉ* means, either he will die or he won't die.

These examples show that the fact whether they denote negation or assertion is ascertained either from the context or *perhaps* from the difference in the position of the accent. As regards the words like *ceyyāy* and *ceyyīr*, they seem to have had the accent on the first syllable if they denoted assertion and on *ā* or *ī* if they denoted negation. Originally, they may have been respectively imperative second person singular and plural. The same may have been pronounced with such a tone as to convey interrogative sense as is done even now. From such interrogative uses, the negative meanings of such forms may have been developed.

WHAT IS THE ORIGIN OF 'Ā' OF ĀTU IN MUTALĀTŬ? VĀRĀTŬ, Etc. *Ā* is said by Tolkāppiyaṉār to be one of the terminations added to verbal themes to denote neuter plural, and it is not stated there that it denotes neuter plural only in the negative voice; but he uses such verbs as *ākā* in Tol. E. 60, *navilā* in Tol. E. 74, *mikā* in Tol. E. 263 only with a negative meaning. The author of Naṉṉūl has definitely stated that *ā* is used to denote neuter plurals only in the negative voice.[2] Hence I think that *ā* began to be considered in the earliest times as the particle of negation in neuter plural. Afterwards, forms like *tiriyatŭ*[3], *mutalātŭ*[4] which are found in Tolkāppiyam may have been formed by adding the neuter singular termination *tŭ* to the theme formed by the root with the negative particle *ā* suffixed to it. Then this particle *ā* may have been used in verbal nouns like *ceyyāmai* and then it may have given room to the idea that it (*ā*) existed even in the form *ceyyāy*.[5]

---

1. *Vallār tiṟai-koḷvar, vallār tiṟai-koṭuppar; . . . aruḷāṉ vekuḷāṉ ivai col-l-oṉṟē viti-viṉaiyum maṟai-viṉai-y-um-āyiṉa.* (I K. p. 39.)
2. *Aā iṟṟa pala-v-iṉ paṭarkkai*
   Ā-v-ē etir-maṟai-k kaṇṇa tākum. (Na. 329.)
3. *Yā-v-eṉ viṉā-v-u m-ā-y-iya ṟiṟiyāṭŭ.* (Vol. E. 176.)
4. *Ā-v-ō ṭallatŭ yakara mutalātŭ.* (ibid. 65.)
5. *Etir-maṟai-k-kaṇ maṟai-y-uṇarttum*
   iṭai-nilai-y-u m-uṇmaiyāṉ. (Vol. Col. 450, Cēṉā.)

If so, how are we to account for the participial form *ceyyā* in *ceyyāniṉṟāṉ* which denotes affirmation. Tolkāppiyaṉār has not mentioned it. Cēṉāvaraiyar says that *ceyyū* was changed to *ceyyā*. Hence *ā* of the verbal participle *ceyyā* in *ceyyāniṉṟāṉ* is not a negative particle. Later on, *ceyyā* may have heen used as a negative particle also.

3.2222213. *PASSIVE AFFIRMATIVE VOICE*: Tolkāppiyaṉār has not stated anything abont the passive affirmative voice or *viti-c-ceyappāṭṭuviṉai* as is called by the author of Ilakkaṇakkottú. But in connection with third case he (Tolkāppiyaṉār) states that the third case-suffix is used to denote the *kartā* or the doer of the action also. This is possible only if passive voice was current in his time. Besides he uses the expression *eṉa-p-paṭupa* in Tol. E. 1. But passive forms are rare in the literature of the ancient period. (e.g.) *kaippaṭukkappaṭṭāy nī* (Ka. T. Vol. 2. 548. 15). In the literature and inscriptions of the medieval period, verbs in passive voice are frequently used.

(e.g.) *ceyyappaṭṭadu* (it was done). (Ep. I. Vol. XVII. Part VII. V. G. p. 330, line 30 & 31.)

irakkappaṭṭadu (it was taken down). (*Ibid.* line 112.)

eṉṉappaṭṭadu (it was said so). (*Ibid.* line 110.)

kuḍukkappaṭṭadu (it was given). (I.A. Vol. 22, p. 71 M. M.P.) (for koḍukkappaṭṭadú.)

iḻittapperukuvatākavum (so that it may be despised). (S. I. I. ii, 509.)

kaṭṭappaṭṭú (having been built). (T. 20, 6.)

On the basis of these later passive formations, the author of Vīracōḻiyam has stated that in the *karmakāraka* or passive voice, the root *paṭu*, or some other one is added to the original root followed by *'a'* and then the personal terminations are added.[1] Its commentator mentions *taku* in addition to *paṭu*. From the fifth example mentioned above, the root *peṟu* also may be added to the list.

---

1. *Viṉai-k-kuṟippōṭú karumam-paṭarkkaiyiṉ mikka-v-oṉṟai*
Aṉaitteṉṉalām-a-v voṭu-paṭu-t-tātu-piṉṉ-ām-iyaṟkai
Taṉai-k-karumam-perun tātu-k-kaṇ-maṟṟum paṭu-viṉai-pōl
Niṉaikka-varu-maṟ ṟ-ivaiyum-peyarcco nikarttiṭumē. (V. K. 11.)

The author of Nan̲n̲ūl has not mentioned anything about it. The author of Pirayōkavivēkam mentions it in the commentary on P. V. 36. The author of Ilakkaṇakkottŭ agrees with the author of Vīracōl̲iyam and adds that the active form itself may be used for the passive.[1] Examples for the latter are found in the Sangam works.

vaḷaii (for *vaḷaikkappaṭṭu*) (having been surrounded). (P.N. 18, 1.)

tal̲īi for (*tal̲uvappaṭṭu*) (having been adhered to). (Pattu. 224. 301.)

It seems to me that, before the time of Vīracōl̲iyam and even for some time after him, the expressions *ar̲iyappaṭṭān̲*, *ar̲iyattakuvan̲* may have been viewed as made up of two words *ar̲iya* and *paṭṭān̲* and *ar̲iya* and *takuvan̲*. This is perhaps the reason why Nan̲n̲ūlār has not mentioned it. Besides, passive voice is also formed, as Dr. Caldwell says, 'by means of the preterite verbal participle of any neuter active verb followed by the preterite third person singular neuter of the verbs to become, to be, to go, or occasionally to end.'[2] (e.g.) *atu muṭintatŭ*, (it was finished); *atu muṭintāyir̲r̲ŭ* (it was finished). Sometimes, expressions like *aṭi uṇṭān̲* for *aṭikkappaṭṭān̲* also are used. I quite agree with Dr. Caldwell that in Colloquial Tamil 'the root *paṭu* is sometimes added even to intransitive roots and sometimes to denote, other than passive signification [3] (e.g.) *nān̲ nan̲r̲āy cāppiṭappaṭṭavan̲* does not mean ' I have been well-eaten, but I am accustomed to eat well !'

But on the whole, the genius of the Tamil language is to avoid the passive voice as far as possible. This is one of the important points where Tamil differs from Sanskrit.

3.2222214. *PASSIVE NEGATIVE VOICE* ; The passive negative voice is formed in the same way as the passive affirmative voice, except that the particles of negation are added here to the roots followed by such auxiliary verbs as *paṭu*. Hence the following forms may be had :

cir̲akkappaṭṭatan̲r̲ŭ (it is not considered advisable).

kāṇappaṭṭilatŭ (it was not found).

1. I. K. p. p. 44 and 45.
2. C. D. G. 464.
3. *Ibid.* 468.

uraikkappaṭṭiṉṟu (it was not said).
kāṇappaṭēṉ (I will not be found).
kāṇappaṭāṉ (he will not be found).
kāṇappaṭātu (it will not be found).
kāṇappaṭēṉallēṉ (I will not be found).

Such a use of negative voice is not at all found in Sanskrit and is a peculiar development in Tamil language.

3.222222. *IMPERATIVE MOOD* : 3.2222221. *AFFIRMATIVE VOICE* : Tolkāppiyaṉār mentions that the form *ceyyāy* of the second person singular is sometimes used as *cey*[1] and in such cases *ī* or *ē* preceded by a suitable consonant are added after it,[2] as *ceṉṟī* (from the root *cel*) and *niṉmē* (from the root *nil*). This evidently holds good in the affirmative voice. He has not definitely stated the exact forms that should be used in the imperative mood. But from the literature of the Sangam period we are able to understand that the forms *ceyyāy, cey, ceyyi, ceyyī* and *ceyyai* were used as second person singular and *ceyyīr* and *ceymiṉ* as second person plural in the affirmative voice of the imperative mood.

(e.g.) *aṟiyāy* (know). (A.N. 268. 1.)
kēḷ (listen). (Pattu. 131. 38.)
cel (go). (Ka. T. Vol. 2. 477. 32.)
varaiti (allot). (P.N. 8. 7.)
ceṉṟī (go). (Ka. T. Vol. 542. 15.)
kaṇṭī (find). (*Ibid.* 542, 8.)
kēṭṭai (listen). (*Ibid.* 546. 23.)
kāṇīr (see). (Cilap. 209. 12. & 265. 226.)
cērmiṉ (reach). (P.N. 9. 5.)

In the literature of the medieval period, the form *ceymiṉkaḷ* formed by adding *kaḷ* to the plural from *ceymiṉ* is frequently used. (e.g.) *toḻumiṉkaḷ* (T. 32. 9.) *cērmiṉkaḷē* (P.T. 58, 1).

The author of Vīracōḻiyam mentions that the root form like *cey* is used as the second person singular, the forms like *ceyyum, ceymiṉ* and *ceyyāmē* as honorific singular and the forms like

---

1. *Ceyyā y-eṉṉu muṉṉilai viṉai-c-coṟ*
Cey-y-eṉ kiḷavi y-ākiṭa ṉ-uṭaittē. (Tol. Col. 450.)
2. *Muṉṉilai muṉṉa r-ī-y-u m-ē-y-um*
Aṉṉilai marapiṉ mey-y-ūrntu varumē. (ibid. 451.)

ceyyuṅkaḷ and *ceymiṉkaḷ* as the second person plural in the affirmative voice of the imperative mood.[1]

As regards the form *ceyyum* it was used at the time of Tolkāppiyaṉār only as the third person singular and third person neuter plural in the indicative mood[2]. If that is so, we have to explain how the same form began to be used in honorific singular of the second person imperative mood at the time of Vīracōḻiyam. It seems to me that the latter form is not the same *ceyyum* but is the corrupted form of *ceymiṉ* or *ceymē* through the intermediate stage *ceyum*. Still the old form *ceyyum* was used in the Tolkāppiyan sense by *Kampar—malai-k-kuṉṟamaṉaiyāṉ varum* (Kampar. A. 214. 2.), *kaiyai-k-kaiyinerikkum* (Kampar. A. 220. 11). In the colloquial speech of modern days *ceyyum* is used only in the honorific singular. The form *ceyyāmē* may have been originally used in the sense 'let us go' where 'us' refers to the person spoken to and the speaker and then was used as the second person honorific singular. But this form seems to be extinct now.

Naṉṉūlār follows the author of Vīracōḻiyam as regards the singular[3] but mentions the termination *miṉ* alone as regards the plural.[4]

At the present day the forms that are used in the affirmative voice of the imperative mood, in colloquial speech, are the same as those mentioned by the author of Vīracōḻiyam except the form *ceyyāmē*.

---

1. *Ōṅkāta-muṉṉilai-p pāl-ēval-āṅkā l-orum aiy-iṟ-cu-p*
Pāṅkār-ciṟappilā mēyu-miṉ-ka-p-paṉmai y-ām-iṭattu
Nīṅkāta-miṉkaḷuṅ kaḷḷām-icai-v-iṉ-iṟ ka-v-v-eṉpatāṉ
Tāṅkā-p-parōkka-t tiṉiṟ-pōlum-ām-eṉpar tāḻ-kuḻalē. (V. K. 9.)
2. *Pallōr paṭarkkai muṉṉilai taṉmai*
A-v-vayiṉ mūṉṟu nikaḻuṅ kālattu-c
Ceyyu m-eṉṉun kiḷavi-y-oṭu koḷḷā. (Tol. Col. 227.)
3. *Naṭa-vā maṭi-cī viṭu-kū vē-vai*
No-p-pō vaṉ-v-uri ñ-uṇ-porun tiruntin
Tēy-pār cel-v-v vāḻ-kē ḷ-a∴ keṉṟu
Eytiya-v-irupāṉ mūṉṟā m-īṟṟavum
Cey-y-e ṉ-ēval viṉai-p-pakā-p paṭamē. (Na. 137.)

53. *Ir-īr īṟṟa iraṇṭu m-iru-tiṇai-p*
Paṉmai muṉṉilai miṉ-avaṟ ṟēval. (Na. 337.)

It seems to me that the form *ceyya veṇṭum* has also been used in the imperative mood since the time of Tolkāppiyaṉār.[1] This form appears to be a kind of periphrastic formation made up of the gerundial form of a root followed by *vēṇṭum*—the future form of the root *vēṇṭu* primarily signifying request. Perhaps this periphrastic formation was devised to supply the gap in the first and third persons in the imperative system.

3.2222222. *NEGATIVE VOICE* : Tolkāppiyaṉār has not definitely stated any form to represent the negative voice in the imperative mood, though he has used the two words *aḻiyal* and *añcal* in the second person singular, imperative negative voice in Tol. Poruḷ. 146. But from the literature of the different periods we may say that the following forms *ceyyal, ceyyāy, ceyyāli, ceyyēl* were used in the singular and *ceyyīr* in the plural. (e.g.)

peyaral (do not change). (P. N. 3. 14.)
ēkal (do not go). (Kampar. A. 225. 19.)
nīṅkāy (do not go away). (Ka. T. Vol. 2. 470. 21.)
nillāti (do not stand). (Ibid. 468. 21.)
uḷ aḻiyēl (do not feel sorry). (Kampar. A. 225. 18.)
ayarēl (do not feel sorry). (Kampar. A. 239. 38.)
ayarīr (Plural). (Kampar. A. 275. 87.)

Besides it seems the form *ceyyavēṇṭā* was used both in the singular and the plural. (e.g.) *nī varuntavēṇṭā* (P. N. 101. 10).

In modern times the forms that are used in colloquial speech are *ceyyāy* or *ceyyātē* in the singular, *ceyyātēyum* in the honorific singular and *ceyyātīr* or *ceyyātēyuṅkaḷ* in the plural.

It appears that, at the time of Tolkāppiyaṉār and the author of Vīracōḻiyam, the imperative mood expressed not only command but also request, wish, etc. more or less in the same way as the imperative in Sanskrit. This is clearly seen from the statements of Tolkāppiyaṉār[2] and the author of Vīracōḻiyam[3] that the

---

1. *Itu-ceyal vēṇṭu m-eṉṉuṅ kiḷavi*
Iru-vayi ṉilaiyum poruṭ-ṭ-ā kum-mē
Taṉpā l-āṉum piṟaṉ-pā l-āṉum. (Tol. Col. 243.)

2. *Avaṟṟuḷ*
Muṉṉilai taṉmai y-ā-y-i-r-iṭattoṭu
Maṉṉā t-ākum viyāṅkōṭ kiḷavi. (Tol. Col. 226.)

3. *Oṅkāta-muṉṉilai-p-pāl-ēval-āṅkā l-orumai-y-iṟ-cu-p*
Pāṅkār-ciṟappiṭā mē-y-u miṉ-ka-p-paṉmai-y-ām-iṭattu
Nīṅkāta-miṉkaḷ-uṅ kaḷ-ḷ-ām-icai-v-iṉiṟka-v-v-eṉpatāṉ
Tāṅkā-p-parōkka-t t-in-iṟ-pōlum-ām-eṉpar-tāḻ-kuḻalē.
(V. K. 9.)

optative mood is used only in the third person singular and plural. But at the time of Naṉṉūlār, it seems to me that the imperative began to be restricted only to denote command and the optative began to be used to denote wish, request, etc. since he says that the optative forms like *celka*, *celliya* and *celliyar* could be used in both singular and plural of all persons.

There is one difference between the imperative mood in Tamil and that in Sanskrit; in the former, it is used only in the second person, except in the case of instances like *ceyyaveṇṭum* which appear to represent a type of periphrastic imperative formation as explained above, whereas in the latter, it is used in all persons.

3.222223. *OPTATIVE MOOD* : 3.2222231. *AFFIRMATIVE VOICE* : Active voice in the optative mood in Tamil verbs expresses request, injunction, wish, etc. in the same way as the Sanskrit potential and benediction as the Sanskrit benedictive. Tolkāppiyaṉār mentions that *viyaṅkōḷ* or optative mood is used only in the third person, both singular and plural where it has the same form in *āṇpāl, peṇpāl, palarpāl, oṉṟaṉpāl* and *palaviṉpāl*.[1] But what its form is he does not seem to have mentioned. He uses the verbs *aṟital* and *kāṭṭal* as optative mood in Tol. Col. 458 and 463 respectively.

The author of Vīracōḻiyam agrees with Tolkāppiyaṉār in the meaning and the use of the optative mood and improves upon him by saying that its form is obtained by adding '*ka*' to the roots.[2] Naṉṉūlār differs from them both in its application and the form. It is used in all persons and numbers and the forms mentioned are *ceyka, ceyyiya* and *ceyyiyar*.[3] The author of Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam agrees with Naṉṉūlār in its application, but as regards its formation he adds the forms ending in *al, āl, um, mār* and *ai*.[4]

---

1. *Eñciya kiḷavi y-iṭattoṭū civaṇi*
 Ai-m-pāṟku m-uriya tōṉṟa l-āṟē. (Tol. Col. 225.)
 Avaṟṟuḷ
 Muṉṉilai taṉmai y-ā-yī r-iṭattoṭū
 Maṉṉā t-ākum viyaṅkōṭ kiḷavi. (ibid. 226.)
2. V. K. 9. *See* F.N. p. 156, 3.
3. *Ka-ya-v-oṭū ra-v-v-oṟ ṟ-īṟṟa viyaṅkōḷ*
 Iyalu m-iṭam-pā l-eṅku m-eṉpa. (Na. 338.)
4. *Ka-ya-v-oṭū ra-v-v-oṟ ṟ-al-āl um-mār*
 Ai-kā nīṟṟa viyaṅkōṉ muṟṟavai
 Eytu m-iṭam-pā l-eṅku m-eṉpa. (I. V. 239.)

HISTORY OF GRAMMATICAL THEORIES IN TAMIL

BY

DR. P. S. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRI,

Principal, Raja's College of Skt. and Tamil Studies, Tiruvadi.

The opinion of the author of the Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam seems to me to be the most acceptable when we take into consideration the forms used in the literature from the Sangam period onwards. He has himself given quotations in his commentary on the sūtra 239. The following may be added to them.

vāḻiya nī (May you live long) (Ka. T. Vol., 2. 583. 21.)
vāḻiyar yāṉ (May I live long). (P. N. 365. 9.)
vāḻiyar pala (May many prosper). (P. N. 371. 25.)
nī vāḻiyar (May you live long). (P. N. 137. 14.)
ceytēṉ ākuka (May I be considered to have done it). (P. N. 71. 9.)
celvai y-ākuvai (May you be considered to have gone) (P. N. 70. 15.)

(The last two may be regarded as periphrastic formations.) In addition to these it seems the form *ceyyāy* also was used in the second person singular of the affirmative voice of the optative mood. (*e.g.*) *kāvāy kōvē* (Oh-king! may you protect) (Kampar. A. 241. 41.)

In colloquial speech such forms as *vāḻaṭṭum, vāḻakkaṭavāṉ vāḻakkaṭavāḷ* etc., are generally used in the third person.

3.2222232. *NEGATIVE VOICE:* In the negative voice such forms as '*peyaral*' formed by adding the negative particle *al* to the root are found. *e.g., niṉ coṟ peyaral* (P. N. 3. 14.) which means 'may your command never change'. They may have arisen under the following conditions:—Forms like *peyarāy-allāy* may have been in use in the second person singular similar to *celvēm allēm* (P. N. 36, 11) in the first person plural, *ollāṉ allaṉ* (P. N.97, 21) in the third person singular. Then *peyarāy-allāy* may have been reduced to *peyar-al* in the same way as *ceyyāy* to *cey*. Or forms like *peyar-alāy* may have been in use similar to *cel-*

lalam (P. N. 101, 1), *aṟiyalam* (P.N. 239, 9.) and they may have been reduced to *peyar-al.*

In colloquial Tamil at present the form *vāḻāyāka* (I wish you not to prosper) is generally used in the negative voice. This may be considered to be a periphrastic formation made up of a negative verb in the negative voice of the indicative mood and the optative affirmative form *āka* of the root ' *ā* '.

3.222224. *ECCAM* or *INFINITIVE MOOD* : *Eccam* is primarily divided into two classes *peyar-eccam* and *viṉai-y-eccam.*

3.2222241. *PEYAR-ECCAM* : *Peyar-eccam* corresponds to the participle in Sanskrit. It is of four kinds :—active affirmative relative participle, active negative relative participle, passive affirmative relative participle and passive negative relative participle. Each of these may be further divided into three according as it denotes the past, present or future action. Invariably each qualifies a noun following it.

3.22222411. *ACTIVE AFFIRMATIVE RELATIVE PARTICIPLE* : According to Tolkāppiyaṉār the form *ceyta* is the past active affirmative relative participle and the form *ceyyum* is both the present and the future active affirmative relative participle.[1] The finite verbs, which take *'iṉ'* as in *uṟaṅkiṉāṉ* to denote the past, have their active affirmative relative participle in the form *uṟaṅkiya.* (e.g.,) *maṇ ṭiṇinta nilaṉum* (The land full of earth) (P. N. 2. 1.) ; *nilaṉ ēntiya vicumpum* (The sky which is above the land) (P.N. 2. 2.) ; *muttī-viḷakkil tuñcum poṟkōṭṭimayamum* (P. N. 2. 23, 24.) (The Himalayas with gold peaks where sleep (the deer) in the light of triad-fire). Here *tuñcum* is the present relative participle; *teṉpula vāḻnarkku aruṅkaṭaṉ iṟukkum* . . . *putalvar* (sons who offer oblations to manes residing in the south) (P. N. 9. 3). Here *iṟukkum* is the future relative participle. The form *ceykiṉṟa* as the present active affirmative relative participle is scarcely found anywhere in Sangam works. I came across the word *'cērkiṉṟa'* in the sentence *'cērikiṉṟa kaṇkaviṉ,* in Paripāṭal (Pari. 163. 35). This may be taken as a participial noun in the plural number meaning "those that join" and qualifying the plural

---

1. *Nilaṉum poruḷ-uṅ kālam-uṅ karuvi-y-um*
Viṉai-mutaṟ kiḷavi-y-um viṉai-y-u m-uḷa-p-paṭa
A-v-v-aṟu poruṭkum-ō r-aṉṉa v-urimaiya
Ceyyuñ ceyta v-eṉṉuñ collē. (Tol. Col. 234.)

noun *kaṇ*. The form '*iṟavāniṉṟa*, which is found in Kuraḷ 1157 may be explained in the same way.

But in the literature and inscriptions of the medieval period, present active affirmative participles of the forms *ceykiṉṟa* and *ceyyāniṉṟa* are found in large numbers.

(e.g.) *celvam-uyarkiṉṟa celvar* (Rich men who are becoming richer). (T. 1. 5.)

cellāniṉṟa āṇṭu (The year which is passing). (T. A. S. i. 14.)

It also seems to me that the form *ceykiṟa* was very frequent in colloquial speech of that period. Hence the author of the Vīra-cōḻiyam says that the present participle is formed by adding *kiṟa*, *āniṉṟa* or *cu* to the root. The past participle is formed according to him by the addition of *ta*, *ṉa* or *ya* and the future participle by that of *kum* or *um*.[1] In the example *cey cāttaṉ*, he seems to take *cey* and *cāttaṉ* as separate words where *cey* is the present active affirmative relative participle which is formed by adding the participle *cu* (corresponding to *su*, the nominative singular suffix in Sanskrit) which is evidently dropped afterwards. This is done by him only to get the designation *pada* to *cey*, since, according to him, *pada* is '*suptiṅantam*.' But *ceycāttaṉ* may be taken as a compound and hence it would have been better if he had omitted it. In *kiṟa* and *āniṉṟa* mentioned by him it seems to me that '*a*' is the sign of the participle and *kiṟu* and *āniṉṟu* are the present tense signs. I do not know why he failed to mention the form *ceykiṉṟa* which was frequently used in the works that were written before his time.

The author of Naṉṉūl follows him, but substitutes the form *ceykiṉṟa* for the form *ceykiṟa*.[2] The author of the Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam

---

1. *Tātu-v-iṉ-piṉpu* ta-ṉa-ya-v-iṟappi ṉikaṭci-y-iṉ-kaṇ
Otuṇ-kiṟa-cu-v-v-o ṭ-āniṉṟa-v-āṅ-kum-m-um m-ōṭū-maṟ kāṉ
Pētamali-y-u m-etiriṉ-kaṇ-ākum *piṟavum-vantāl*
Ētam-il catirān-tam-piḻai-y-ā ma l-iyaṟṟi-k-koḷḷē.
(V. Tāt. 7.)

2. *Ceyta* ceykiṉṟa *ceyyum-eṉ-pāṭṭil*
Kālam-uñ ceyal-un tōṉṟi-p-pāl-otū
Ceyva t-āti aṟu-poruṭ peyarum
Eñca niṟpatu peyar-ec cam-m-ē. (Na. 340.)

follows Naṉṉūlār.[1]

3.22222412. *ACTIVE NEGATIVE RELATIVE PARTICIPLE* : In the ancient period only the form *ceyyāta* seems to have been in use and it may have been used in all tenses. (e.g.) *payaṉ illāta col* (word which is of no use) (K. 198). Even now the form *ceyyāta* is used in all tenses though more frequently in the past and the future : (e.g.)

itai-c-ceyyāta paiyaṉ aṭikkappaṭṭāṉ (the boy who did not do this was beaten). (*Colloq.*)

itai-c-ceyyāta paiyaṉ aṭikkappaṭukiṟāṉ (the boy who does not do this is beaten). (*Colloq.*)

itai-c-ceyyāta paiyaṉ aṭikkappaṭuvāṉ (the boy who will not do this will be beaten). (*Colloq.*)

Besides the form *ceyyāta,* the periphrastic forms *ceyyāmal irunta, ceyyāmal irukkiṉṟa* and *ceyyāmal irukkum* are respectively used in the past, present and future tenses.

3.22222413. *PASSIVE AFFIRMATIVE RELATIVE PARTICIPLE.* In the works of the ancient period perhaps except in Kuṟaḷ it seems that there was no form belonging to this class. In the later periods the forms *ceyyappaṭṭa, ceyyappaṭukiṉṟa* and *ceyyappaṭum* are used in the past, present and future tense respectively. (e.g.)

kuyavaṉāṟ ceyyappaṭṭa kuṭam (pot which was made by the potter). (*Colloq.*)

taccaṉāṟ ceyyappaṭukiṉṟa nārkāli (chair which is made by the capenter). (*Colloq.*)

aracaṉāṟ kaṭṭappaṭum māḷikai (palace built by the king). (*Colloq.*)

3.22222414. *PASSIVE NEGATIVE RELATIVE PARTICIPLE* : As in the case of forms of passive affirmative relative participle, it seems to me that there were no forms for this in the ancient period except in Kuṟaḷ. In the later periods, the form *ceyyappaṭāta* was used in all tenses. In modern times the periphrastic forms *ceyyappaṭāmal-irunta, ceyyppaṭāmal irukkiṉṟa* and

1. *Avaṟṟuḷ*
Ceyta ceykiṉṟa *ceyyum-eṉ pāṭṭil*
Ceyva t-āti aṟu-poruṭ peyar-oṭū
Muṭiyu muṟaiyatū peyar-ec cam-m-ē. (I. V. 243.)

ceyyappaṭāmal-irukkum are also found used in the past, present and future tenses respectively. (e.g.) *kēṭkappaṭāta cevi* (K. 418).

The author of the Pirayōkavivēkam says that the suffix denoting the active participles corresponds to *śatṛpratyaya* and *kānac pratyaya* in Sanskrit and the passive participles like *ceyyappaṭṭa* end in *kānacpratyaya*. It must be noted here that *śatṛ* and *kānac* in *gaccan* and *gamyamāna* are two entirely different *pratyayas*, while '*a*' in *ceyta* and *ceyyappaṭṭa* is one and the same.

3.22222415. *WHAT IS THE ORIGIN OF 'A', THE ENDING OF THE PRESENT AND PAST PARTICIPLES CEYKIṈṞA, IṞAVĀNIṈṞA, CEYTA, ETC.?* From the use of the words *ceykiṉṟa* and *iṟavāniṉṟa* in the Paripāṭal and the Kuṟaḷ[1] respectively qualifying plural nouns *kaṇ* and *vaḷai*, it seems to me that *ceykiṉṟa*, *iṟavāniṉṟa* and *ceyta* may have been the nominative neuter plurals of the neuter singular forms *ceykiṉṟŭ*, *iṟavāniṉṟŭ*,[2] *ceytŭ*, when they were used as participial nouns. I have already shown at some length how the finite verbal forms could be used as participial nouns and declined in all cases. Originally they may have been used to qualify neuter plural nouns, but later on, since the neuter plural nouns like *kaṇ*, *tuḷai*, etc. had the same form as the singular as an alternative for *kaṇkaḷ*, *tuḷaikaḷ*, etc. the words like *ceykiṉṟa* may have been used along with singular nouns and later on may have been used to qualify all kinds of nouns. Dr. Caldwell thinks[3] that '*a*' is a possessive case sign; but I have already shown that the possessive case sign '*a*' mentioned by Naṉṉūlār may have evolved from '*a*' the sign of the neuter plural in verbs.

3.2222242. *VIṈAI-Y-ECCAM*: *Viṉai-y-eccam* corresponds to indeclinable past participles like Sanskrit *gatvā* and gerunds like the infinitive of purpose *gantum* in Sanskrit, and infinitive verbal forms denoting condition and cause, which are not found in Sanskrit.

The indeclinable past participles are of two kinds—the affirmative past participle and the negative past participle. The

---

1. *Ceykiṉṟa kaṇ.* (Pari. 163, 35.)
   Iṟavāniṉṟa vaḷai. (K. 1157.)
2. *Ceykiṉṟŭ*:—*cey* (root) + *ku* (cāriyai) + *iṉ* (cāriyai) + *ṟŭ* (neuter singular termination.)
3. C. D. G. 523.

affirmative indeclinable past participial forms are according to Tolkāppiyaṉār *ceytū*, *ceyyū* and *ceypū*. He does not mention the negative indeclinable past participial forms; but uses the form *koḷḷātū* in Tol. Col. 198, and this form is frequently used in literature. (*e.g.*) *vāyil viṭātū kōyil pukkēm* (we entered the palace without informing the gate-keeper) (P. N. 67. 10). According to Tolkāppiyaṉār, the forms that are gerunds are *ceyyiyar*, *ceyyiya*, *ceyaṟkū*, *ceyteṉa* and *ceya*, and the form that is used as infinitive denoting condition is *ceyiṉ*.[1]

CEYTŪ: This is formed, I think, by adding *tu* to the root *cey*. It denotes an action done previous to that which is denoted by the verb which it qualifies. (*e.g.*) *ceytū vantāṉ*. It may be noted here that this suffix *tu* and the stem *tu* of the suffixes *tum*, *tvā* and *tavē* in *gantum gatvā* and *sartavē* of Vēdic Sanskrit are similar. In addition to the form *ceytū*, the forms *pōy* and *uṟaṅki* are used. Here *tu* is not added to the root, but *y* or *i* is added. If *i* happened to be the earlier suffix, it may be said that it was changed to *y* in the case of certain verbs. These forms *ceytū*, *uṟaṅki* and *pōy* have lived to the present day, unlike the forms *ceyyū* and *ceypū*.

CEYYŪ: Cēṉāvaraiyar and Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar mention that this denotes an action done previous to that denoted by the verb finite or infinite which it qualifies.[2] (e.g.) *itai puṭaiyū . . . eṟṟi* (Pattu. 227. 376). But there are examples where it denotes an action more or less simultaneous with that denoted by the verb which it qualifies. Thus in the sentence '*tōḷ ōcci valaṉ vaḷaiyūu-p-pakal makiḻ tūṅkum*' (Pattu. 136. 145.) which means 'dancing at day time with the left shoulder bent towards the right', the word *vaḷaiyūu* qualifies the present participle *tūṅkum* and the action of bending denoted by it remains so long as the action of dancing denoted by *tūṅkum* remains. Hence it seems that Teyvaccilaiyār has mentioned that this form *ceyyū* may

---

1. *Ceytū ceyyū-c ceypū* ceyteṉa-c
Ceyyiyar ceyyiya ceyiṉ-ceya-c ceyaṟkeṉa
A-v-vakai y-oṉpatum viṉai-y-eñcu kiḷavi.
(Tol. Col. 228.)

2. *Ukāram uṇṇūvantāṉ, tiṉṉū-vantāṉ eṉap*
Piṉ-varum toḻiṟkū iṭai-y-iṉṟi muṉ-varum
Toḻiṉ-mēl iṟanta-kālam pōṟṟi varum.
(Tol, Col. 228. Cēṉā.)

denote an action simultaneous with that of the word which it qualifies.[1] This form *ceyyū* sometimes changes to *ceyyā*.[2]

The author of the Pirayōkavivēkam says that this corresponds to the form *kāram* in Sanskrit where the *ṇamulpratyaya* is added to the root.[3] There is no purpose served by taking it so. This has almost given place to the form *ceyyā* even in the ancient period. (e.g.) *katavu eṟiyā civanturāy* (P. N. 4. 10).

CEYPŪ : Cēṉāvaraiyar thinks that this denotes an action simultaneous with that which is denoted by the word which it qualifies. Teyvaccilaiyār and Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar quote one and the same sentence '*pularā-p-paccilai-y-iṭai-y-uṭupu toṭutta*' where the action denoted by *uṭupū* is previous to that denoted by *toṭutta* and hence think that the form *ceypū* may also denote an action previous to that denoted by the verb which it qualifies. This agrees with the use of the word '*teripū*' in *teripū-vēṟu kiḷattal* (Tol. Col. 49) by Tolkāppiyaṉār himself. This like *ceyyū*, is practically extinct.

The form *CEYYĀTŪ* evidently denotes the absence of an action that should have been done before that denoted by the verb which it qualifies. (e.g.) *nirayaṅ koḷpavaroṭū oṉṟātū . . . . ōmpu mati* (P. N. 5, 6 & 7). The form *ceyyāmai* is used in the same sense by Tolkāppiyaṉār in the sūtra

Aṭai-ciṉai mutal-eṉa muṟai-mūṉṟu mayaṅkāmai
Naṭai-peṟ ṟiyalum vaṇṇa-c ciṉai-c-col. (Tol. Col. 26.)

In addition to them the form *ceyyāmal* is found in Sangam works. (e.g.) *tīrāmaṟ kāppatōr tiṟaṉuṇṭēl* (Ka. T. Vol. 1, 287. 13.): *ceyyāmaṟ ceyta-v-utavi* (K. 101). The latter form is more frequently used in modern days than the former.

What could have been its origin ? I venture to suggest the following explanation.

From the frequent use of compound forms like *celvēm allēm* (P. N. 31. 11.), *toḻutaṉam allamō* (P. N. 60. 6.) in old Tamil literature, it may not be unreasonable to suppose that a compound formation of the type of *kāṇām allām* was also current beside the forms *kāṇēm allēm*, and *kāṇvaṉam allam*. Now it is

1. *Ceyyū-eṉpatū iṟanta-kālamum nikaḻ-kālamum kāṭṭum.* (Tol. Col. 228, Tey.)
2. Ceyyā v-eṉṉum viṉai-y-eñcu kiḷaviyum. (Tol. E. 223.)
3. *Ceyyā-c* ceyyū-c *ceypu-v-e ṉ-eccaṅ*
Kamuñ-ē ṇamul-ē *yap-p-eṉa lākum.* (P. V. 38, Comm.)

easy to see how an extended from like *kāṇāmal* representing the negative indeclinable participle may have sprung up, by the line of separation being erroneously drawn between *kāṇāmal* and *ām*. In all probability, the form *kāṇāmal* which arose in this manner may have been used first in association with a verb of the first person plural and subsequently may have acquired an extended use in association with other persons and numbers also. Then the forms like *ceyyāmal* may have sprung up. The form *ceyyāmē*[1] is also found in use.

GERUNDS: *CEYYIYAR AND CEYYIYA*: These mean exactly 'for the purpose of doing'. Hence they qualify a word which denotes an action previous to that denoted by itself. These two are practically extinct now. It is worth noting that the gerunds *ceyyiyar* and *ceyyiya* are similar in form to that of the finite verbs in the optative mood. cf. *nī vāḻiyar* (P.N. 137.14); *vāḻiya nī* (Ka. T. Vol. 2.583.21).

CEYAṞKŪ: This conveys the same sense as *ceyyiyar* and *ceyyiya*. In form it appears to be the fourth case of the verbal noun *ceyal*. It is similar to the form *sartavē* in Vedic Sanskrit since both the forms are dative. Examples like *varaṟkū* (to come) (P. N. 64. 7), *valañceyaṟkū* (to go round in clock-wise directing) (P. N. 6. 18) are very frequent in literary works. But in modern times the form *ceyvataṟkū* is more frequently used than the form *ceyaṟkū*.

CEYA: This conveys the same meaning as *ceyyiyar*, *ceyyiya* and *ceyaṟkū*, when it qualifies a finite verb, a participle, indeclinable past particiciple or another gerund. This is sometimes used as an absolute. In examples like *maḻai peyya, kuḷam niṟaintatū*, (rain falling, the tank became full) the gerund *peyya* denotes an action previous to that denoted by the verb *niṟaintatū* which follows it; and in examples like *ñāyiṟu paṭa, avaṉ vantāṉ*, (the sun setting, he came) the gerund *paṭa* denotes an action simultaneous with that denoted by the verb *vantāṉ* which follows it: It may also denote an action subsequent to that denoted by the verb which it qualifies (e.g.) *makkaḷ cukamāy irukka tantai paṇañ cērttāṉ.* (The father amassed wealth so that his children may live happily.) This form has lived to the present day. Sometimes, the form *ceyya* takes its place.

---

1. *Añcaṉa vaṇṇaṉ-eṉ ṉ-ār-uyir nāyaka ṉ*-āḷāmē
(my dear life-giver, blue in colour as collyrium, not ruling.) . . . . . (Kampar. kuka. 14.)

CEYIṈ: This means 'if you do'. A similar infinitive form is not found in Sanskrit. This form *ceyiṉ* is frequently used in the works of the Sangam period. (e.g.) *paricil nalkuvaiyāyiṉ* (if you give presents) (P. N. 116. 5). This may be taken as an ablative infinitive. It is similar in form to the ablative infinitive *gantōḥ* in Vēdic Sanskrit, though they differ in sense. The form is gradually giving place to the form *ceytāl* which is evidently a third case formed from the stem *ceytu*. (e.g.) *eṇṇiyiruntāl* (if you have thought) (Kampar. A. 276. 88.)

In the ancient period the negative form corresponding to *ceyiṉ* is *ceyiṉallāl*. (e.g.) *niṉ kaṇ peṟiṉallāl* (Ka. T. Vol. 2, 524. 8). In modern days the forms *ceyyāviṭiṉ* and *ceyyāviṭṭāl* are used instead.

CEYTEṈA: This form is generally used as an absolute, though there are instances like *viḻuttakai perukeṉa vēṇṭutum* (Pari. 93. 117) where it is used like other gerunds. It generally denotes the cause of the action denoted by the verb which follows it. e.g. *putuppeyal poḻinteṉa kōvalar . . . vēṟu pulam parappi* (Since there were new showers, shepherds having gone to new lands (Pattu. 323, 2 to 4) and hence it should invariably denote an action previous to that denoted by the verb which follows it. This form has almost died out.

In addition to the above forms, Tolkāppiyaṉār has mentioned the forms *ceytapiṉ*, *ceytamuṉ*, *ceytakkāl*, *ceyvaḻi*, *ceyyiṭam*, etc., which end in the words *piṉ*, *muṉ*, etc. which denote time.

Besides, the form *ceyiṉum* is used in the literature of the ancient period in the sense 'though one does'. (e.g.) *nī vēṇṭiṉum* (though you want) (Ka. T. Vol. 2,576,20). This is evidently formed from *ceyiṉ* by the addition of the particle *um*. This is to a certain extent parallel to the form *kṛtvāpi* (*kṛtvā*+*api*) in Sanskrit.

The author of the Vīracōḻiyam mentions that the particles *poruṭṭu*, *ka*, *pāṉ*, *taṟku*, *vāṉ* and *a* are added after roots to give the sense of *tumanta* (*i.e.*) gerunds.[1] The examples for the

1. *Maṉṉum* tumantam poruṭṭu-k-ka-p-pāṉ-taṟku vāṉ-a-v-eṉṟu
Paṉṉum-eḻiṟ-ṟātu viṉ-piṉpil-ākum pakaril-muṉpu
Tuṉṉiya tātu-t taḻiṟ-poruṭṭāka v-eṉṉun-toṭarcci
Uṉṉiya-pōteṉṟu teyva-p-pulava r-uraittaṉarē.
(V. Tāt. 8.)

same are found in the commentary under the same stanza :—They are *uṇṇutaṟporuṭṭu vantāṉ* (he came to eat), *kaṟka tārpariyattāṉ* (he intended to read), *paṭippāṉ vantāṉ* (he came to read,) *pōtaṟkū niṉaintāṉ* (he thought to go), *aṟivāṉ karuttuṇṭù* (he desired to know), *uṇṇa vallaṉ* (he is able to eat). Here it is evident that the forms *uṇṇutaṟporuṭṭù* and *pōtaṟkū* are respectively the fourth case of the verbal nouns *uṇṇutal* and *pōtal*. The forms *kaṟka* and *uṇṇa* come under the same category as *ceya* mentioned by Tolkāppiyaṉār. In the case of *paṭippāṉ* and *aṟivaṉ* in the sentences '*paṭippāṉ vantāṉ*' and '*aṟivāṉ karuttuṇṭù*, they may have been originally finite verbs and were later on taken as gerunds.

How this happened may thus be explained. Tolkāppiyaṉār recognises the use of a number of finite verbs without conjunctive particles, in syntactic agreement with the same subject.[1] It does not require much effort to see that collocations of this kind—*puttiyāṉai vantatu kāṇpāṉ yāṉ taṅkiṉēṉ* (I stayed to see the new elephant) (Ka. T. Vol. 2, 592, 7), *colliṉāṉ . . . tēṟṟuvāṉ* (Kampar. A. 213, 16), *paṇam cērppāṉ paṭippāṉ varuvāṉ* (he came to read so that he might earn money) (*Colloq.*)—may have led to forms like *kāṇpāṉ*, *cērppāṉ*, *paṭippāṉ*, being taken as gerunds in the sense of *cērkka* and *paṭikka*.

Similarly he says that the particles *ā*, *ittu*, *tu*, *u* and *i* are added to roots to convey the sense of *tvānta*.[2] The examples for the same are, as given in the commentary, *uṇṇā-p-pōṉāṉ*, *uṇṭiṭṭu-p-pōṉāṉ*, *uṇṭu-pōṉāṉ*, *pukuntu-pōṉāṉ*, *pukku-p-pōṉāṉ*, and *colli-niṉṟāṉ*. Of these *a*, *tu* and *i* have already been mentioned. The particle *iṭṭu* is evidently the indeclinable past participle of the root *iṭu* and it seems to have been used in the colloquial speech at the time of the author of the Vīracōḻiyam as a particle giving the sense of *tvānta*. The form *pukkū* may have originally been *pukkū* and *ū* may have been shortened to *u*.

The author of the Nēminātam has omitted the forms *ceyyiyar* and *ceyyū* mentioned by Tolkāppiyaṉār, since such forms may

1. *Avaitām*
Tattaṅ kiḷavi y-aṭukkuna variṉum
Ettiṟat tāṉum peyar-muṭi piṉavē. (Tol. Col, 429.)

2. *Ā-v-um*-iṭṭu-*n*-tu-*v-v*-u-*m*-i-*v-v-iṉoṭiyyu m-arum-pulavar*
Ēruṅ-karuttā v-iru-toḻiṟ k-oṉṟitiṉ muṉpu-niṉṟù
Mēvum-poruṭ-ṭātu viṉ-piṉ-varu-mikka taṉ-peyarē
Pāvum-tuvāntam-a tām-eṉṟuraippar paṉi-moḻiyē.
(V. Tāt. 9.)

have gone out of use in his time, incorporated the forms ending in *ā* and *pāṉ* mentioned by the author of the Vīracōḻiyam and has added another form ending in *pākkŭ*.[1]

The author of Naṉṉūl has mentioned all the forms noted by Tolkāppiyaṉār except *ceyaṟkŭ* and adopted the forms ending in *ā*, *vāṉ* and *pāṉ* from the author of the Vīracōḻiyam and the forms ending in *pākku* from the author of the Nēminātam.[2]

Cēṉāvaraiyar in his commentary under Tol. Col. 229 mentions the form ending in *pākkŭ* and also other forms ending in *āl* as *ceytāl* and *mal* as *ceyyāmal* (negative), etc. (e.g.) *oṉṟu kuṟaipaṭāmal* (Cilap. 57. 9.)

Naccinārkkiṉiyar in his commentary under the same sūtra adds a form ending in *vākkŭ*.

The author of the Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam repeats what has been said by the author of the Naṉṉūl.[3]

WHAT IS THE PROBABLE ORIGIN OF THE FORMS ENDING IN PĀKKŬ AND VĀKKŬ? There are three instances where the suffix *pākkŭ* is used in the Kuṟaḷ. They are found in the Kuṟaḷ, 136, 164 and 1312. In the first two, the word *paṭupākkŭ* appears and in the last, *eṉpākkŭ*. From the context they mean only *paṭutal* and *eṉṉutal*. *Pākkŭ*, here, may be understood as a suffix added to a root to form a verbal noun denoting the action alone. Thus a form like *paṭupākkŭ* may be analysed into the root *paṭu*, the formative suffix *pu* and *ākkŭ* the noun form of the root *ākŭ*. But the forms ending in *pākkŭ* and *vākkŭ* mentioned by the authors of the Nēminātam and the Naṉṉūl and Naccinārkkiṉiyar are gerunds. Naccinārkkiṉiyar quotes a sentence '*puṉar-taru-cevan-taru-pākku-c-ceṉṟāṉ*' as an example of the gerund ending in *pākku* and quotes a colloquial expression '*koḷvākkŭ vantāṉ*' as an example of the gerund ending in *vākkŭ*. They are very rarely used in literature. What could have been their origin?

---

1. *Ceytŭ ceya-c-c-ceyyā-c ceyyiya ceyteṉa-c*
Ceypŭ ceyiṉ-ceyar keṉpaṉavum-moy-kuḻalāy
Piṉ-muṉ-pāṉ pākkum piṟavum viṉai-y-ecca-c
Coṉ-muṉ vakuttōr tuṇivu. (N. N. Col. 43.)

2. *Ceytŭ ceypŭ ceyyā-c ceyyū-c*
Ceyteṉa-c ceya-c ceyiṉ ceyyiya ceyyiyar
Vāṉ-pāṉ pākkiṉa viṉai-y-eccam piṟa
Ainton ṟ-āṟum mukkālam-um muṟai-tarum. (Na. 343.)

3. (I. V. 246.) *See* fn. 2 *supra*.

Uṉpākkŭ and *koḷvākkŭ* may have arisen through haplology as crippled forms of *uṉpākkukkŭ* and *koḷvākkukkŭ*, the dative singular of *uṉpakkŭ* and *koḷvakkŭ*.

The author of the Pirayōkavivēkam has mentioned only the forms *ceyya, ceyyu, ceypu, ceyiṉ, ceytāl, ceytŭ* and *ceya* and coins the following sūtras to make these forms correspond to those in Sanskrit:—'*ceyyā-c-ceyyū-c-ceypu veṉeccaṅ-kamuñē, ṇamulē yap-peṉal ākum*' '*eṉaveṉ eccam itiyeṉal ākum*' '*ceyiṉ ceytāleṉa-c-ceppum iraṇṭiṉai iticēt teṉpar aṟinticiṉōrē*'. These mean that the forms *ceyya, ceyyu* and *ceypŭ* respectively correspond to the forms in Sanskrit ending in *khamuñ* (e.g. *cauraṅ kāram* in *cauraṅkāram ākrōśati*), *ṇamul* (e.g. *smāram smāram*) and *yap* (e.g. *avagamya*); the form *cepteṉa* corresponds to *kṛtvā iti*; the forms *ceyiṉ* and *ceytāl* correspond to *karōti cēt.* He also mentions that the form *ceytŭ* corresponds to *kṛtvā* and *ceya* to *kartum.* Since no useful purpose is served by these sūtras of correspondence, I think they are unnecessary in a treatise on Tamil grammar.

In colloquial speech only the form *ceytŭ* remains for the indeclinable past participle, the forms *ceya* and *ceytaṟkŭ* for the gerund, *ceyiṉ* and *ceytāl* to denote condition and *ceytālum* and *ceyiṉum* to denote contrast in the affirmative; and in the negative voice *ceyyāmal* (e. g. *kuṟaipaṭāmal* (Cilap. 57. 9) for the indeclinable past participle, *ceyyāmal iruppataṟkŭ* for the gerund and *ceyyāmal iruntāl* and *ceyyāmal iruntālum* to denote condition and contrast respectively. The presence of many forms for the gerund in the affirmative in the ancient Tamil and only a few in the modern period reminds one of the similar process of change in the history of Sanskrit infinitives.

3.23. *IṬAI-C-COL:* 3.231. *DEFINITION*: Tolkāppiyaṉār mentions in the sūtras

Iṭai-y-eṉa-p paṭuva peyaroṭum viṉai-y-oṭum
Naṭai-peṟ ṟ-iyalum tamakkiyal p-ilavē. (Tol. Col. 249.)
Avaitām
Muṉṉum piṉṉu moḻi-y-aṭuttu varutalum
Tam-m-īṟŭ tiritalum piṟitava ṇilaiyalum
Aṉṉavai y-ellā m-uriya v-eṉpa. (ibid. 251.)
Avaitām
Puṇariya ṇilai-y-iṭai-p poruṇilai-k-kutanavum
Viṉai-ceyaṉ maruṅkiṟ kālamoṭu varunavum

Vērrumai-p poruḷ-vayi ṉ-urupā kunavum
Acai-nilai-k kiḷavi y-āki varunavum
Icai-niṟai-k-kiḷavi y-āki varunavum
Tattaṅ kuṟippù poruḷ-cey kunavum
Oppil vaḻiyāṟ poruḷ-ccy kunavum-eṉṟù
A-p-paṉ piṉavē nuvaluṅ kālai. (ibid. 250.)

that *iṭai-c-col* has no separate existence of its own, it is used along with nouns and verbs either as a part of them or before or after them and consists of the flexional increments, personal terminations of verbs, case-suffixes, particles added for the sake of euphony or for making up the quantity of verse, particles of conjunction and interjection, and those denoting comparison, etc. From this it is clear that *iṭai-c-col* in Tamil corresponds to *pratyayas* and *nipātas* in Sanskrit. The author of the Nēminātam repeats the idea contained in Tol. Col. 250 only.[1] The author of the Naṉṉūl summarises in one sūtra[2] all that is said by Tolkāppiyaṉār, in the three sūtras mentioned above. The author of the Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam[3] and the Tonnūlviḷakkam[4] more or less repeat what is said by Naṉṉūlār. All the commentators of the Tolkāppiyam and the later grammarians think that Tol. Col. 249 deals with the definition of *iṭai-c-col.*

But it seems to me that Tolkāppiyaṉār did not intend either Tol. Col. 249 or all the three sūtras Tol. Col. 249, 251 and 250 for the purpose of defining *iṭai-c-col;* for, the most important feature of *iṭai-c-col* is that it is a *pratyaya* or formative element or a *nipāta.* This is suggested by the name *iṭai-c-col* which

---

1. *Cāriyai-y-ā y-oṉṟa l-urupāta ṟaṅ-kuṟippiṉ*
Erum poruḷ-āta niṉṟicai-y-āy-p-pērtal
Viṉai-c-coṟkīr ṟāta l-icai-niṟaittu mēval
Aṉaittē y-iṭaī-c-co l-aḷavu. (N. N. Col. 50.)
2. *Vēṟṟumāi viṉai cāriyai oppu urupukaḷ*
Tattam poruḷa icai-niṟai acai-nilai
Kuṟippe ṉ-eṇ-pakutiyiṉ taṉittiya l-iṉṟi-p
Peyariṉum viṉaiyiṉum piṉ-muṉ ōriṭattù
Oṉṟum palavum van toṉṟuva t-iṭai-c-col. (Na. 420.)
3. *Vēṟṟumai viṉai-cā riyai-y-op purupukaḷ*
Tattam poruḷa v-icāi-niṟai y-acai-nilai
I-t-tiṟa m-ēḻiṟ ṟanittiya l-iṉṟi-p
Peyariṉum viṉaiyiṉum piṉ-muṉ n-ōr-iṭattù
Oṉṟum palavūm-vaṉ toṉṟuva t-iṭaiccol. (I. V. 251.)
4. T. V. 130.

means 'the side word'. That this is his idea is well seen from the sūtra

Iṭai-c-col l-ellām vēṟṟumai-c collē. (Tol. Col. 455.)

where he says that every *iṭai-c-col* is *vēṟṟumai-c-col.* Here *vēṟṟumai-c-col* evidently means differentiating element, *i. e.* an element which differentiates the relation between the governing base or word to which it is appended and the following verb. For instance the case-suffix *ai* in '*irāmaṉai*' specifically defines the character of *ramaṉ's* relation to the following verb as its object, since the stem *irāmaṉ*, by itself, admits of several kinds of relation such as the subject, instrument, recipient, etc. Similarly *ā* in *vantāṉā* makes the assertive verb *vantāṉ* an interrogative verb and so on.

Having suggested that *iṭai-c-col* is a formative element or a *nipāta*, Tolkāppiyaṉār says in Tol. Col. 249 and 251 that it does not possess a separate existence, but is used as a part of nouns or verbs or before or after either of them. He then enumerates them in detail in Tol. Col. 250.

3·232. IS *IṬAI-C-COL VĀCAKA* OR *DYŌTAKA?* Cēṉāvaraiyar and Teyvaccilaiyār mention in their commentary on Tol. Col. 249 that the word '*tamakkiyalpila*' suggests that *iṭai-c-col* is not a *vācaka* but only *dyōtaka*, i.e. it does not have a meaning of its own, but only suggests that the noun or verb which it accompanies has a particular meaning. They have said so, I think, in imitation of a class of Sanskrit grammarians who hold that *upasargas* or prepositions and the case suffixes in Sanskrit are *dyōtaka* and not *vācaka*. For instance in *upakarōti* the element *upa* does not have any meaning of its own, but suggests that the root *kṛ* in *upakarōti* means to help, though it can have other meanings elsewhere. Similarly, the case suffixes suggest that the base is an object to a verb, recipient, etc.

But I think that this is not quite consistent with the definition given by Tolkāppiyaṉār that *col* is that which has a meaning.[1] I have already said in 3.1 supra that Tolkāppiyaṉār seems to follow the opinion of the Sanskrit logicians. According to the latter even the *pratyayas* are *vācaka*. Besides, even those Sanskrit grammarians who think that *upasargas* and case suffixes are

---

1. *Ellā-c collum poruḷ-kuṟit taṉa-v-ē.* (Tol. Col. 155).

dyōtaka take the verbal terminations to be *vācaka* and not *dyōtaka*.

If that be so, one may ask what the importance of the word '*tamakkiyalpila*' in the sūtra Tol. Col. 249 is. It evidently suggests that *iṭai-c-col* does not have a separate existence of its own outside nouns or verbs or the sentence made up of nouns or verbs.

3.233. *PARALLELS*: The sentence '*iṭai-y-eṉappaṭuva peyaroṭum viṉaiyoṭum naṭaiperriyalum*' in Tol. Col. 249 seems to find a parallel in '*upasargā viṃśatirarthavācakāḥ sahētarābhyām* (R. V. P. 12.6). Here one may point out that the latter deals only with *upasarga,* while the former deals with *pratyayas* and all *nipātas.* But the expression '*sahētarābhyām*' is so beautifully translated by Tolkāppiyaṉār into '*peyaroṭum viṉaiyoṭum*' that it may apply to all *pratyayas* and *nipātas.*

Besides it seems to me that Tolkāppiyaṉār in giving a list of *iṭai-c-col* with their meanings in *iṭai-y-iyal* may have had for his model the first chapter of Yāska's Nirukta where Yāska deals with *nipātas.* The following parallels may be noted:—

1. *ciṟappoṭu . . . ōkārammē* (which means the particle *ō* is used to denote superiority.) Tol. Col. 256:
   cit . . . pūjāyām (Y. N. 33.12.) (*pūjā=ciṟappu.*)
2. *pirinilai . . . ōkārammē* (which means the particle *ō* is used in *pirinilai.*) Tol. Col. 256:
   aha iti ca ha iti ca vinigrahārthīyāu (Y. N. 37.2.) (*vinigraha=pirinilai.*)
3. *antil āṅka-v-acainilai-k-kiḷavi* (which means that the words *antil, āṅka* are used simply to make up the quantity of the verse.) Tol. Col. 267:
   athāpi padapūraṇā idamu tadu (Y. N. 37.4) (*pada-pūraṇa=acainilai-k-kiḷavi.*)

3.234. Prepositions in Tamil are very rare. That which approximates to it in early literature is *koṉ* in *koṉṉūr. Koṉṉūr* is mentioned by the author of the Pirayōkavivēkam as a compound having the *nipāta koṉ* as the first member.[1] It may be said to be similar in form to *upagrāmam* in Sanskrit. In the later periods the nouns like *kai* in *iṟaiyiliyāka-k-kai-k-koṇṭu* (S. I. I. iii, i, 44.6), *puṟam* in *puṟaṅ-koṭuttāṉ* are considered as prepositions. (c. f. P. V. 45, comm.)

1. '*Koṉṉūr*' *eṉa avviyaya-pūrva-patam-āy vanta avviyayī-pāvam-ākiya muṉ-moḻi-y-iṭai-c-col varum.* (P.V. 23 comm.)

3.24. *URI-C-COL*: 3.241. *DEFINITION*: Tolkāppiyaṉār mentions in the sūtra

Uri-c-coṟ kiḷavi virikkuṅ kālai
Icai-y-iṉuṅ kuṟippiṉum paṇpiṉun tōṉṟi-p
Peyariṉum viṉaiyiṉu mey-taṭu māṟi
Oru-coṟ pala-poruṭ k-urimai tōṉṟiṉum
Pala-col l-oruporuṭ k-urimai tōṉṟiṉum
Payilāta vaṟṟai-p payiṉṟavai cārtti-t
Tatta marapiṟ ceṉṟu-nilai maruṅkiṉ
E-c-col l-āyiṉum poruḷ vēṟu-kiḷattal. (Tol. Col. 297.)

that *uri-c-col* in its detailed significance denotes *icai, kuṟippù* and *paṇpù*. Its form undergoes modification in nouns and verbs. It may have many meanings or it may have the same meaning as others of its kind and it is to be explained in literature by means of words ordinarily current in the world.

All the commentators of the Tolkāppiyam mistake that this sūtra defines *uri-c-col*. Cēṉāvaraiyar feeling that the statement 'that it has many meanings, etc.' is out of place in the sūtra dealing with definition, says that though the author states that it is used in nouns and verbs with its form modified, etc., it should be defined as that which denotes *icai, kuṟippù* and *paṇpù*.[1] Teyva-ccilaiyār says that, since Tolkāppiyaṉār has mentioned *uri-c-col* as *kuṟaiccoṟkiḷavi* in *Eḻuttatikāram*, it is identical with *dhātu* in Sanskrit.[2]

The author of the Nēminātam summarises Tol. Col. 297 in N. N. Col. 56. The author of the Naṉṉūl defines that *uri-c-col* is that which is exclusively used in poetry, which cannot be separated from nouns and verbs and which denotes one *kuṇam* or quality or many qualities.[3] The author of the Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam reproduces the idea contained in Tol. Col. 297 with the modification that it

---

1. *Mey-taṭu-māṟalum oru-coṟ pala-poruṭ-kuṟi-mai-y-um, pala-col oru-porūṭ-kurimaiyum uri-c-coṟkù uṇmaiyāṉ ōtiṉārēṉum, uri-c-corkù ilakkaṇam-āvatu* icai kurippu-p paṉpeṉṉum poruṭ-kuriyavāy varutalēyām. (Tol. Col. 297, cena.)

2. *Eḻuttatikārattuḷ itaṉai kuṟai-c-coṟ-kiḷavi eṉṟù ōtiṉamaiyāl, vaṭanūl-āciriyar* tātù *eṉṟù kuṟi-y-iṭṭa coṟkaḷē ivai-y-eṉṟù koḷḷappaṭum.* (Tol. col. 292, Teyva.)

3. *Pal-vakai-p paṇpum pakar-peya r-āki*
Oru-kuṇam pala-kuṇan taḻuvi-p peyar-viṉai
Oruvā ceyyuṭkù uriyaṉa uri-c-col. (Na. 442).

is used either as *viṉai-p-pōli* (verb in imitation) and *peyar-p-pōli* (noun in imitation) or as the base of nouns or verbs and mentions in his commentary on the same that *karuppu, civappu* are *peyar-p-pōli* and *uṟu, tava* are *viṉai-p-pōli* in the same way as Cēṉāvaraiyar has done under Tol. Col. 297. Besides, he states that there are some Tamiḷ grammarians who hold that *uri-c-col* is mostly found in poetry.

It seems to me that Tol. Col. 297 does not deal with the definition of *uri-c-col.* If it deals with it, all the lines except the first two are out of place, as is suggested by Cēṉāvaraiyar. Its definition is suggested by the name *uri-c-col. Uri-c-col* does not mean the word belonging to only poetry as Naṉṉūlār thinks, nor the word denoting quality belonging to objects as Cēṉāvaraiyar and others think. It means the word denoting the independent part of a noun or verb; for the word *urimai* means 'right' and hence independence. Its nature in form is clearly expressed in the sūtra—

Eḻuttu-p-pirin ticaitta l-ivaṉiyal p-iṉṟē. (Tol. Col. 395.)

which may be translated thus:—'It is not in its nature capable of being further analysed'. This and the word *kūṟai-c-coṟkiḷavi* mentioned in the last but one sūtra of *Eḻuttatikāram* clearly suggest that *uri-c-col* is the root of nouns or verbs. It cannot be taken to be identical with Sanskrit *dhātu* as mentioned by Teyvaccilaiyār since *dhātu* is, according to the Sanskrit Grammarians, a verbal root and since Tolkāppiyaṉār has not suggested anywhere in his work that all nouns are derived from verbal roots. Teyvaccilaiyār seems to have said so thinking that Tolkāppiyaṉār follows the theory of Śākaṭāyana and Nāiruktas that all nouns are derived from verbal roots.[1] But it seems to me that he follows the theory of Gārgya and another section of Sanskrit grammarians who hold that it is not necessary that all nouns should have been derived from verbal roots.[2] The chief reason for the latter view is that neither Tolkāppiyaṉār nor the later grammarians have attempted to derive all nouns from verbal roots. Hence *uri-c-col* may be taken as the nominal or verbal root.

1. *Tatra nāmāni ākhyātajānīti Śākaṭāyanō nairukta-samayaś ca.* (Y.N. 56, 2.)

2. *Na sarvāṇi ity eva gārgyo vaiyākaraṇānāñ caike.* (Y. N. 56, 3.)

3.242. *NATURE OF URI-C-COL*: If so, what is the purpose served by Tol. Col. 297? I may say that it explains it. The part '*icaiyiṉum kuṟippiṉum paṇpiṉum tōṉṟi*' means 'used to denote *icai* (sound) *kuṟippu* (feeling) and *paṇpu* (*jāti*=genus *guṇa*=quality or *kriyā*'=action'). The part '*orucol palaporuṭ kurimai tōṉṟiṉum*' means 'though the same root can have different meanings'. The part '*palacol oruporuṭ kurimai tōṉṟiṉum*' means 'though different roots are used in same sense'. The part '*payilātavaṟṟai payiṉṟavai cārtti . . . kiḷattal*' means 'one should explain the meaning of the root which is not current by one which is current'.

3.243. *URI-Y-IYAL* IN *TOLKĀPPIYAM* AND *YĀSKA'S NIRUKTA*: A close examination of the first sūtra in this section (*uri-y-iyal*) and those that follow, and the second, third and fourth chapters of Yāska's Nirukta shows that Tolkāppiyaṉār may have had Nirukta for his model. The portion '*orucol palaporuṭ kurimai tōṉṟiṉum*' has a parallel in '*ēkārtham anēkaśabdam ityētaduktam* (Y. N. 265.1).' The portion '*palacol oruporuṭ kurimai tōṉṟiṉum*' has a parallel in '*atha yānyanēkārthāni ēkaśabdāni tānyatō anukramiṣyāmaḥ* (Y. N. 266.2)'. The expression '*payilātavaṟṟai*' has a parallel in '*anavagatasaṃskārān ca nigamān* (Y. N. 266.3). The expression '*veḷippaṭu collē*' has a parallel in '*saṁvijñātāni tāni*' in the sentence '*tadyatra svara saṁskārau samarthau prādeśikena guṇena anvitāu syātām saṁvijñātāni tāni*' (Y. N. 56.4).

The list of *uri-c-col* given by Tolkāppiyaṉār may be divided into that which deals with verbal roots and that which deals with nominal roots. For instance, the words *vārtal, pōkal, tīrttal* etc., in Tol. Col. 317 & 318 denotes only the verbal roots *vār, pō, tīr* exactly in the same way as *āvayati, bhavati, vēti,* etc. given in Y.N. page 195, *rēḷatē, hēḷatē,* etc., in page 197 of the same, etc. The words *viḻumam, cīrmai, karuvi* mentioned in Tol. Col. 353 and 354 are similar to *mahat, budhnaḥ,* etc. given in Y. N. page 213. But at the same time, it should be borne in mind that Tolkāppiyaṉār does not seem to have incorporated in Tamil grammar the theory of the Nāiruktas that all nouns are derived from verbal roots.

It may be interesting to note that the Tamil word *uṟu* found in the sūtra '*uru tava naṉi . . mikuti ceyyum poruḷa*' (Tol. Col.

299) and the Sanskrit word *uru* in *'uru tuvi puru . . . iti dvādaśa bahunāmāni* (Y.N. 212.1) both head the list of words having the sense 'much'. The Tamil grammarians have not been able to satisfactorily explain the derivation of the Tamil *'uṟu'* and the Tamil *'tava'* in the sense of 'much'. But a consideration of the Nirukta parallel indicated above (*uru tuvi* . .) might help any one in equating the Tamil *uṟu* and *tava* in the sense of 'much' with Sanskrit *uru* and *tuvi* in the same sense, and in appreciating the correspondence between the two sets of words both on the phonological and semantic sides. The way in which Tolkāppiyaṉār frames a list of words whose derivation cannot be ascertained—such as *naṉi, kaṭi*—is very similar to the manner in which Yāska frames a list of *asaṁvijñāta* words like *jahā, nidhā,* etc. in pp. 267 and 269 of the Nirukta.

Besides, Tolkāppiyaṉār first gives the list of roots which have the same meaning and then only roots which have different meanings. In Nirukta too, list of words having the same meaning is given in the second and third chapters and the list of those having different meanings is given in the fourth and fifth chapters.

On considering the above points, it may be clear that Tol. Col. 294 does not deal with the definition of *Uri-c-col.* The statement of Naṉṉūlār that it is used only in poetry was made on account of the mistaken notion that only the words like *uṟu, tava, naṉi,* etc. whose derivation is believed to be obscure are *uri-c-col.* He seems to have failed to note the sūtra *'veḷippaṭu collē kiḷattal vēṇṭā, veḷippaṭa vārā uricconmēṉa'* (Tol. Col. 298) which means that the *uri-c-col* which are in use are not mentioned here and only those which are not in use, are mentioned.

I really wonder how Cēṉāvaraiyar and the author of Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam countenance the opinion of Naṉṉūlār that *uri-c-col* is found only in poetry as an alternative theory. The reason for this, it seems to me, is that they may have mistaken *viḻumam, cīrmai,* etc. mentioned in Tol. Col. 353 for noun forms, since they say that *karuppu, civappu,* etc. are *peyar-p-pōli* while such forms evidently represent nominal roots as explained above.

From the above arguments one can very well see that it would not be correct to say that all words are *uri-c-col,* as the

author of the Pirayōkavivēkam has said in one place (P. V, 18, comm. p. 31.) or to include it in *iṭai-c-col* as the same grammarian has done in another place (P. V. 42, comm.); nor would it be correct to define *uri-c-col* as 'one of a few indeclinables which always have the force of adjective or adverb[1].

4. WORD-FORMATION AND COMPOUNDS.

4·1. *WORD-FORMATION*: It seems to me that according to Tolkāppiyaṉār that words, generally nouns and verbs, are formed by suffixing one or more *iṭai-c-col* to *uri-c-col*, as *kariyaṉ*, *kariyaḷ*, etc. or by suffixing *iṭai-c-col* to nouns or verbs as *valaiyaṉ*, *uṇṇēṉai*, etc.

The author of the Vīracōḻiyam, in imitation of Pāṇini's grammar, names the suffixes that are added to words as *taddhita* and gives their list in V. Tat. 1, 4 and 5. They are *aṉ*, *iyaṉ*, *īṉaṉ*, *ēyaṉ*, etc.; *mai*, *am*, *pu*, *tu*, *vu*, *kām*, etc.; and *acci*, *āṭṭi*, *aṉi*, *ātti*, *āḷ*, *aḷ*, *i*, etc. The examples given by the commentator for the same are *valaiyaṉ*, *vētiyaṉ*, *kulīṉan*, *vaiṉatēyaṉ*, etc.; *valimai*, *nilam*, *melippu*, *valitu*, *melivu*, *kuṟukkam*, etc.; *paṟaicci*, *veḷḷātti*, *pārppaṉi*, *vaṇṇātti*, etc. Here an unnecessary mixing-up of Sanskrit *taddhita pratyayas* and Tamil *pratyayas* has been done; for instance, *īṉa* in *kulīṉa* and *ēya* in *vaiṉatēya* are Sanskrit *pratyayas;* the *pratyayas* given in V. Tat. 4 are strictly speaking *kṛt pratyayas;* but the author of the Vīracōḻiyam seems to take it that *valimai*, *kuṟukkam*, etc. are formed from the nouns *vali*, *kuṟu*, etc., which, in his opinion, are formed from the roots *val*, *kuṟ*, etc. But we do not find such verbal forms as *val* and *kuṟ*. As regards the third list the same confusion made. The Sanskrit word *brāhmaṇastrī*, if Tamilised, becomes *pārppaṉatti* and *pārppaṉacci*. Hence *acci* and *atti* are not, strictly speaking, suffixes. The word *vaṇṇātti* is evidently formed from *vaṇṇāṉ* + *attu* (cāriyai) + *i*, where the *ṉ* of *vaṇṇāṉ* is dropped. Hence all the suffixes noted in V. Tat. 5 could be brought under *i*, *aḷ* and *āḷ*. Similarly he makes mention of *kṛt pratyayas* in V. Tat. 3 and 4.

He forms the nominative case of nouns by adding *cu* and then dropping it, in direct imitation of Pāṇini's grammar.

---

1. T. L. p.

Naṉṉūlār takes the forms *naṭa*, *vā*, etc. as the roots like the author of the Vīracōḻiyam;[1] but does not agree that *cemmai*, *ciṟumai*, etc. are derived from verbs, but says that they are *pakāppatam* or indivisible words.

According to him, the case forms of nouns are framed by adding case-suffixes to nouns are participial nouns, e.g. *kaṇṇaṉai*, *pōṉēṉai* ; *cāriyai* may be inserted before the case-suffix; the verbal forms are formed by adding the tense sign followed by the personal terminations to the roots in general.

All the later grammarians follow Naṉṉūlār[2] except the author of the Pirayōkavivēkam, who follows the author of the Vīracōḻiyam. The parallelism between V. Tat. 2 and 3 and P. V. 31 and 32 is striking. He devides *tattitaṉ* into three as *cāmāṉiya-tattitaṉ*, *avviyatattitaṉ*, and *pāvatattitaṉ*[3], and enumerates them in P. V. 30 to 34. The difference between the author of the Vīracōḻiyam and that of the Pirayōkavivēkam is that the latter does not mix the Tamil suffixes with Sanskrit suffixes though he imports the Sanskritic technical terms.

4.2. *COMPOUNDS*: 4.21. *MEANING OF THE WORD 'TOKAI'*: The word that is chosen by Tolkāppiyaṉār to denote compounds is *tokai*. The word *tokai* is derived from the root '*tokū*' which means to elide and also to join together. Cēṉāvaraiyar[4] mentions that there are two schools of interpretation of

---

1. *Maṇṇiyā-cīr-vaṭa nūliṟ-cara-paca v-eṉṟū-vantū*
Tuṉṉiya-tātu-k kaḷin-*pōli-pōla-t tokū-tamiḻkkum*
Paṉṉiya-tātu-k kaḷai-p-paṭaittu-k-koḷka muṉṉilaiyiṉ
Uṉṉiya-v-ēva l-orumai-c-coṟ-pōṉṟula kiṟkokkavē.
(V. Tāt. 1.)

2. *Naṭa-vā maṭi-cī viṭu-ku vē-vai*
No-p-pō vau-v-uri ñuṇ-porun tirun-tiṉ
Tēy-pār celvav vāḻ-kē ḷ-a:.keṉṟū
Iṉṉavai mutala v-ellā viṉaiyun
Terinilai viṉaiyiṉ mutaṉilai y-ākum. (I. V. 43·)
Naṭa, vā, uṇ, tiṉ *ittoṭakkattaṉa viṉai-p-pakā-p-patam.*
(ibid. 40, comm.)

3. *Cāmā ṉiyam-av viyam-pāva mūṉṟeṉa-t tattītaṉ-vēṟū*
(P. V. 30.)
. . . .

4. *Vēṟṟumai-y-urupum uvama-v-urupum um-m-aiyum viṉai-c-col-l-īṟum paṇpu-c-col-l-īrun tokutaliṟ ṟokai-y-āyiṉa v-eṉpārum, a-v-v-a-p-poraṇmēl irantum palarum-ākiya coṟkaḷ piḷavu-paṭātū oṟṟumai-p-paṭa-t tam-m-uḷ-iyaitaliṟ ṟokai-y-āyiṉa v-eṉpārum-eṉa irūtiṟattār āciriyar.* (Tol. Col. 412, Cēṉā.)

the word *tokai;* one adopts the first meaning of the root *tokŭ* and thinks that *tokai* is that where the case-suffixes, the particle *um*, the particles of comparison, the ending of *paṇpu-p-peyar* and the ending of verbs are dropped and the other adopts the second meaning and thinks that *tokai* is that in which two or more words are joined together. He belongs to the latter school and condemns the former school for the following two reasons:—(1) According to their interpretation even the expressions *ceytāṉ poruḷ* and *iruntāṉ māṭattŭ* would become *tokai* since the case-suffixes *ai* and *kaṇ* have been respectively dropped after the words *poruḷ* and *māṭattŭ*. (2) Even those who hold the former theory cannot but accept the unitary nature of a compound. These two reasons cannot stand if *tokai* is taken to be that in which two are more words or joined together by dropping case-suffixes, etc. Besides, Tolkāppiyaṉār himself describes the unitary nature of compounds in the sūtra

Ellā-t tokai-y-u m-oru-coṉ ṉaṭaiya. (Tol. Col. 420.)

and dropping of case-suffixes, etc., in the sūtra

Paṇpŭ-toka varūuṅ kiḷavi y-āṉuṁ
Ummai tokka peyar-vayi ṉ-āṉum
Vēṟṟumai tokka peyar-vayi ṉ-āṉum
Īṟṟu-niṉ ṟiyalu m-aṉmoḻi-t tokai-y-ē. (Tol. Col. 418.)

where he deals with *aṉmoḻittokai* or *bahuvrīhi* compound. Hence the choice of the word '*tokai*' shows the genius of Tolkāppiyaṉār. It may be very interesting to note here that the Sanskrit name '*samāsa*' also, while it explicitly refers to composition, also implicitly conveys the idea of curtailment as may be seen from the contrast between the Sanskrit words *vyāsa* and *samāsa.* The interpretation of the word *tokai* by Cēṉāvaraiyar and Teyvaccilaiyār is possibly based upon the obvious meaning of the word *samāsa* (composition). Though Teyvaccilaiyār gives this interpretation of *tokai* under Tol. Col. 412, he takes into consideration the other meaning also in the word *tokku* in *paṇpu toka* . . . (Tol. Col. 418).

The author of the Vīracōḻiyam, though he takes *tokai* to correspond to the term *samāsa,* (composition) clearly mentions the elision of case-suffixes, etc. in the former member of the compound (V. T. 1). The author of the Pirayōkavivēkam, on the other hand, says that he agrees with Cēṉāvaraiyar and repeats the reasons assigned by him (P. V. 19, comm. p. 34).

HISTORY OF GRAMMATICAL THEORIES IN TAMIL

BY

P. S. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRI, M.A., Ph.D., L.T.,

Principal, Rajah's College, Tiruvadi.

4.22. *ENUMERATION OF COMPOUNDS* AND *THEIR NATURE.*—Tolkāppiyaṉār classifies compounds under six heads[1]:—*Vēṟṟumai-t-tokai, uvamai-t-tokai, viṉai-t-tokai, paṇpu-t-tokai, ummai-t-tokai* and *aṉmoḻi-t-tokai. Vēṟṟumaittokai*[2] is that in which the members which form the compound stand in case-relation to each other as *poṟ-kuṭam* (gold-pot). It corresponds to *tatpuruṣa* in Sanskrit. *Uvamai-t-tokai*[3] is that in which one member is compared to another as *poṉ-mēṉi* (gold-appearance). It corresponds to *upamāṇa-pūrvapada-karma-dhāraya. Viṉai-t-tokai*[4] is that in which the first member is a relative participle denoting time and the second member is the noun which it qualifies as *kol-yāṉai* (elephant that kills, killed or will kill). It corresponds to a part of *viśēṣana-pūrvapada-karma-dhāraya. Paṇpu-t-tokai*[5] is that in which the first member is generally a quality denoting colour, shape, extent, taste etc., and the second a noun which has that quality as *karuṅ-kutirai* (black horse). This also corresponds to a part of *viśēṣaṇa-pūrvapada-karmadhāraya. Ummai-t-tokai*[6] is that in which each has two or

---

1. *Vēṟṟumai-t tokai-y-ē y-uvama-t tokai-y-ē*
   Viṉai-y-iṉ ṟokai-y-ē paṇpiṉ ṟokai-y-ē
   Ummai-t tokai-y-ē y-aṉmoḻi-t tokai-y-eṉṟu
   A-v-v-ā ṟ-eṉpa tokai-moḻi nilai-y-ē. (Tol. Col. 412.)
2. *Vēṟṟumai-t tokai-y-ē vēṟṟumai y-iyala.* (ibid. 413.)
3. *Uvama-t tokai-y-ē y-uvama v-iyala.* (ibid. 414.)
4. *Viṉai-y-iṉ ṟokuti kāla-t t-iyalum.* (ibid. 415.)
5. *Vaṇṇattiṉ vaṭivi ṉ-aḷaviṟ cuvai-y-iṉ-eṉṟu*
   Aṉṉa piṟavu m-ataṉ-kuṇa nutali
   Iṉṉa t-itu-v-eṉa varūu m-iyaṟkai
   Eṉṉa kiḷaviyum paṇpiṉ ṟokai-y-ē. (ibid. 416.)
6. *Iru-peyar pala-peya r-aḷaviṉ peyarē*
   Eṇ-ṇ-iyaṟ peyarē niṟai-p-peyar-k kiḷavi
   Eṇ-ṇ-iṉ peyarō ṭ-a-v-v-aṟu kiḷaviyum
   Kaṇṇiya nilaittē y-ummai-t tokai-y-ē. (ibid. 417.)

more members, the members being connected with one another by 'and' and denoting persons, measures, numbers, weights etc., as *puli-vil-kenṭai* (tiger, bow and *kenṭai* fish) etc. It corresponds to *dvandva* in Sanskrit. *Aṉmoḻi-t-tokai*[1] is the possessive compound, the members of which may stand to each other in any of the three relations—quality-noun relation, conjunctive relation, and case-relation. It corresponds to *bahuvrīhi* in Sanskrit.

It may be noted here that the *number* of compounds in Tamil agrees with that of *primary* compounds in Sanskrit and the names given to them in Tamil are more suggestive of their function than those in Sanskrit. These compounds are treated in syntax as though they are single words.[2]

The above classification of Tolkāppiyaṉār is fairly exhaustive; but such compounds as *karu-niṟam*, *cārai-p-pāmpu*, where both the members are either qualities or names which denote the genus and species of the same object, are not taken into account; but Cēṉāvaraiyar explains in his commentary on the same sūtra that they too are *paṇpu-t-tokai*, on the strength of the expression *eṉṉa-kiḷaviyum*, which means 'similar words', in the sūtra.

All the later grammarians, except the authors of the Vīracōḻiyam and the Pirayōkavivēkam, *i. e.*, the authors of the Nēminātam, the Naṉṉūl, the Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam and the Ilakkaṇakkottu agree, as regards the classification of compounds, with Tolkāppiyaṉār. And Naṉṉūlār tries to improve upon Tolkāppiyaṉār as regards the definition of paṇpu-t-tokai[3] so that it may apply to compounds like *karu-niṟam*, *cārai-p-pāmpu* etc.

But the author of the Vīracōḻiyam saw that a large number of Sanskrit compounds like *anīti*, *anittiyam* etc., were freely used in Tamil and they, along with some Tamil compounds like *karu-niṟam*, *paṉṉiru-toṭi*, *teṉ-kiḻakku*, could not be directly explained with the rules on compounds stated by Tolkāppiyaṉār. Hence he began to classify them exactly in the same way as is

---

1. *Paṇpu toka-varūuṅ kiḷavi y-āṉum*
Ummai tokka peyar-vayi ṉ-āṉum
Vēṟṟumai tokka peyar-vayi ṉ-āṉum
Iṟṟu-niṉ ṟiyalu m-aṉmoḻi-t tokai-y-ē. (ibid. 418.)
2. *Ellā-t tokai-y-u m-oru-coṉ naṭaiya.* (ibid. 420.)
3. *Paṇpai viḷakkum moḻi-tok kaṉavum*
Oru-poruṭku iru-peyar vantavum kuṇa-t-tokai.
(Na. 365).

done in Sanskrit; *tarpurutan* (tatpuruṣa), *pala-nel* (bahuvrīhi), *kanmatārayam* (karmadhāraya), *tuviku* (dvigu), *tuvantuvam* (dvandva) and *avviyapāva* (avyayībhāva).[1] Some may say that he might have left out *avviyapāva* since examples for it are very rare; it is true, but such words as *yatākkiramam*, the tadbhava of Skt. *yathākrama*, are sometimes found and they have to be explained.

The most important point to be noted in the Vīracōḻiyam, as also in the Pirayōkavivēkam whose author closely follows that of the Vīracōḻiyam with some difference here and there, is that most of the stanzas found in the chapter dealing with compounds (*tokai-p-paṭalam*), in both are exactly the translation of the kārikas on *samāsa* assigned to the authorship of Vararuci in Sanskrit. They are as follows:—

(1) *Ṣōḍhā samāsāḥ saṅkṣēpāt ēkatriṃśad-vidhāḥ punaḥ* |
Tatrāṣṭadhā tatpuruṣaḥ saptadhā karma-dhārayaḥ ||
Saptadhā ca bahuvrīhiḥ dvigur-ābhāṣitō dvidhā |
Dvandvaś-catur-vidhō jñēyōavyayībhāvas-tridhā mataḥ ||
(Var. Kār.)

Tarpuruṭan-pala ner-kanma tārayan tāṅkiya-cīr
Nar-ṟuviku-t-tokai nāvār-tuvantuva nalla-teyva-c
Cor-payan-māntarka ḷ-avviyapāva m-iteṉṟu-toṉmai
Karpakam-ā-p-pakarn tār-tokai-y-āruṅ kaṉaṅkuḻaiyē.
(V. T. 2.)

Tarpuruṭan-ṟuvi ku-p-pala ner-karma tārayaṉōṭu
Urpala vāṉēṭuṅ kaṭ-pacun tē-moḻi y-oṉṭoṭiyāy
Cor-payi l-avvi yayīpāva m-eṉai-t tuvattaṉ-eṉa-k
Karpavar kūṟuñ camācaṉ-ka ḷē-toka-k kaṭṭaḷai-y-ē.
(P. V. 20.)

(2) *Tatpuruṣō' ṣṭa-vidhō bhūt prathamādi-vibhakti-nañ-kṛtāir-bhēdāiḥ* |
Sa caikavadbhāvyanēkavadbhāvīti dvidhā dviguḥ |
(Var. Kār.)

Eḻuvāy-mutal-eḻu vēṟṟumaiyōṭu m-eḻuntaṭaiyil
Vaḻuvātal[1]naññoṭeṭ ṭ-ān-tarpuruṭaṉ vaḷar-tuviku
Taḻuvārnta-veṇmoḻi muṉṉāy-varun taltita-p-poruṉ-mēl
Kuḻuvār-orumai y-oppu-p-paṉmai y-oppu-k-kuṟi-y-iraṇṭē.
(V. T. 3.)

---

1. V. T. 2.

Taṟpuru ṭa-t-tokai vēṟṟumai y-eḷṭaṉuṭ cārnta naññu-c
Coṟ-poru ḷ-aṉmai maṟai-y-iṉmai kāṭṭun tokai-t-tuviku
Muṟpata m-eṇ-piṟ patan-tattitārtta muṭi-ttumeḻūum
Paṟpala v-ēkavaṟ pāvi-y-a ṉēkavaṟ pāvi-y-eṉṟē. (P. V. 21.)

(3) *Saptabhirākhyābhir-vā vikhyātō yas-savai bahuvrīhiḥ* |
Dvābhyām padābhyām bahubhiḥ padāir-vā
Saṅkhyābhidhāyyantyapadam dvayam vā |
Yasyābhavat-pūrvapadē sahaśca
Digantarāla-vyatihāralakṣmā|| (Var. Kār.)
Irumoḻi-paṉmoḻi piṉmoḻi y-eṇṇōṭ-irumoḻi-y-eṇ
Maruvum-vitiyā r-ilakkaṇamaṟṟai-c caka-muṉ-moḻi
Paravun-tikantarā ḷa-t-tokai-y-aṉṉa-p palaneṟṟokai
Viriyum-ōr-ēḻ-avai vēṟṟu-moḻi-p poruṇ-mel-l-iyalē.
(V. T. 4.)
Irumoḻi paṉ-moḻi piṉ-moḻi y-eṇṇō ṭ-irumoḻi-y-eṇ
Ṭaru-moḻi y-oṟṟoḻi tikkan tarāḷañ caka-muṉiṟkum
Oru-moḻi y-ēṉai-viti kāra-lakkaṇattōṭu varum
Peru-moḻi y-āki-veku viriyaṉ moḻi-p-pē-r-aṭaintē.
(P. V. 24.)

(4) *Kavibhis-sapta-vidhas-syād-ityēvam karma-dhārayaḥ*
kathitaḥ |
Viśēṣaṇam pūrva-padē viśēṣyam tathōbhayatrāpi
viśēṣaṇam ca
Yasyōpamānam paratas-tadādāu sambhāvanā cā-
pyavadhāraṇā ca || (Var. Kār.)
Muṉ-moḻi-p-paṇpu m-iru-moḻi-p-paṇpu m-oḻintamainta
Piṉ-moḻi-y-oppoṭu muṉ-moḻi-y-oppum piṇakkoṉ-ṟilā
Muṉ-moḻi-naṟ-karut tum-muṉ-moḻi-naṟṟuṇivum-eṉa
Naṉ-moḻi-y-ār-kaṉma tārayam-āṟeṉṉa nāṭṭiṉarē. (V.T. 5.)
Muṉ-moḻi-p paṇpiru paṇpu vicēṭiya muṉ-moḻi-taṉ
Muṉ-moḻi-t tulliyam piṉ-moḻi-t tulliya moy-kuḻalāy
Muṉ-moḻi-c campā vaṉai-y-ava tāraṇ amuṟṟum-ivai
Naṉ-moḻi-p paṇpu-t tokai-k kaṇma tārayaṉaṟṟamiḻkkē.
(P. V. 22.)

Here the author of the Vīracōḻiyam omitted the class where the noun qualified by the adjective stands as the first member of the compound (*viśēṣya-pūrvapadaḥ*) since, perhaps, it was difficult to him to find an example for it in Tamil language ; and hence he stated that *kaṇmatārayam* is of 6 kinds, instead of 7 as found in Sanskrit. But the author of the Pīrayōkavivēkam has included it also and gives *teyva-p-pulavaṉ-ṟiruvaḷḷuvaṉ* as an example for it.

(5) *Yatrāvyayam pūrva-padam yathāvā*
Subantam-āhō dvītayam subantam |
Pūrvō pi mukhyō bahuśaḥ padārthaḥ
Tathāvyayībhāvam itīrayanti.||
Sahi dvandvaś-caturdhā śyāt budhair-iti viniścitaḥ |
Itaretarayōgākhyaḥ samāhārāhvayastathā. (Var. Kār.)

[1]*Muṉ-moḻi-y-avviyañ-cēṟ tokai pēr-muṉ moḻi-t-tokaiyē*
Coṉ-moḻi-y-avviya pāvamaruvum tuvantuvamum
Vaṉ-moḻi-y-ām-ita rētaram-vāyuta camā-kāram-ām
Naṉ-moḻi-y-āṉ-urait tārkaḷ-camāca naṟu-nutalē. (V. T. 6.)
Muṉ-moḻi-p pēr-c-co l-iṭai-c-co l-iraṇṭu muraṇi-niṟkum
Taṉ moḻi y-avvi yayīpāva m-ummai-c cakārattilē
Iṉ-moḻi-t tontaṉ [2] *camākārāt tōṭita rētaramām*
An-moḻi-t tōṟṟamuñ camuccayat-tōṭu-maṉ vācayamē.
(P. V. 23.)

(6) *Tatpuruṣō aṣṭa-vidhō bhūt*..............|
Uttara-pada-janītārthaḥ prāyō mukhyaḥ......||
.........................*dviguḥ*|
Asyāpi paṇḍitāir-antar-bhāvaḥ tatpuruṣō mataḥ ||
...........*karmadhārayaḥ kathitaḥ* |
Tatpurusāntarbhāvāt tadvad
Prādhanyam īritam cāsya ||
Prādhānyam prāyaśōsmin
Ubhayōs syāt padārthayōḥ |
Sa hi dvandvaḥ..........................||
Taṟpuru taṉ-ṟuvi ku-k-karma tārayaṉ ṟāmutaṉmai
Piṟpata m-ām-ḻu vāy-ā m-orūu-t-tokai peṇ-ṇ-aṇaṅkē
Muṟpata m-avvi yayīpāva m-oppu-muṟai piṟaḻuñ
Coṟ-patan tokkavai y-ellā mutaṉmai tuvantaṉukkē.
(P. V. 25.)

The statement '*avviyayīpāvamoppu-muṟai piṟaḻum*' which means that the relative importance of the first or second member in *avyayībhāva* and *upamitasamāsa* will change, is made on the strength of the words *prāyaḥ* and *bahuśaḥ* in *uttara-pada-janitārthaḥ prāyō mukhyaḥ* and *pūrvōpi mukhyō bahuśaḥ*

---

1. He has not mentioned that class of *avyayībhāva* where the members are nouns, as *madhyēgāram* since such words have not been taken into Tamil language.

2. cf. Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣit's vṛtti on *cārthē dvandvaḥ*— '*samuccaya-anvācaya-itarētarayōga-samāhārāḥ cārthāḥ.*

padārthaḥ respectively. The author of the Vīracōḻiyam, having dealt with this classification of compounds in 5 stanzas, mentions also the classification made by Tolkāppiyaṉār as the opinion of a class of Tamilians.

The only point of difference between these two kinds of classification is only with respect to *avyayībhāva* and *nañtatpuruṣa,* since other *tatpuruṣas, dvandva* and *bahuvrīhi* are identically the same as *vēṟṟumaittokai, ummaittokai* and *aṉmoḻittokai,* though with different names, and *karmadhāraya* and *dvigu* may somehow or other be brought under *uvamattokai, viṉaittokai* and *paṇputtokai.*

4.23. Here I want to deal further with the difference of opinion among the commentators of Tolkāppiyam and Naṉṉūlār regarding *viṉai-t-tokai* and *paṇpu-t-tokai* and whether the expression *nilaṅ kaṭantāṉ* is a *tokai* or not.

4.231. As regards *viṉaittokai,* Iḷampūraṇar, Teyvaccilaiyār and Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar think, that when a present, past, or future, participle like *kollum* or *koṉṟa* is compounded with a noun like *yāṉai,* the participial suffix is dropped and they become *kol-yāṉai.* Hence the word *kol-yāṉai* means 'elephant that kills, that killed or that will kill'. But Cēṉāvaraiyar is of opinion that *kol-yāṉai* is compounded of the root *kol* with *yāṉai* and it cannot be dissolved into *koṉṟa yāṉai, kollukiṉṟa* or *kollum yāṉai.* The interpretation of the latter seems to be unsound, since Tolkāppiyaṉār in his sūtra says that *viṉaittokai* shows time.[1] The reasons adduced by him in support of his statement do not seem to be sound. He has done so, since perhaps he took the expressions like *kol-yāṉai* as a case of *nityasamāsa* like the word *kumbhakāra* mentioned by Dharmakīrti in Vol. I,P. 181 of his Rūpāvatāra. But it seems to me that it is against the views of Tolkāppiyaṉār. Naṉṉūlār agrees with Iḷampūraṇar, while the author of the Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam agrees with Cēṉāvaraiyar and repeats his arguments. (I. V. 338, Comm.)

4.232. As regards *paṇpu-t-tokai,* Cēṉāvaraiyar thinks that the words like *karuṅkutirai* cannot be dissolved into *kariyatu ākiya kutirai* in the same way as in *viṉai t-tokai* perhaps for the same reason. This too is against the views of Tolkāppiyaṉār since, in the sūtra, he says '*iṉṉatu itu eṉa*' (Tol. Col. 416.) Naṉṉūlār seems to think that *karumai+kutirai* becomes *karuṅ-*

---

1. *Viṉaiyiṉ ṟokuti kālat tiyalum.* (Tol. Col. 415.)

kutirai,[1] while Tolkāppiyaṉār thinks that *kariyatu* + *kutirai* becomes so. Naṉṉūlār's view does not seem to be sound since the expression '*karumai ākiya kutirai*' cannot convey any sense since *karumai* and *kutirai* cannot be appositional, *karumai* denoting quality and *kutirai* denoting object. The author of the Ilakkaṇa-viḷakkam agrees with Cēṉāvaraiyar (I. V. 339, Comm.)

4.233. IS '*NILAÑ KAṬANTĀṈ*' WHICH MEANS '*HE CROSSED THE GROUND*', *A COMPOUND OR NOT*? All commentators of Tolkāppiyam, except Cēṉāvaraiyar and his followers think that *nilañ kaṭantāṉ*, when it means "he crossed the ground," is not a compound, but a sentence consisting of two words *nilam* and *kaṭantāṉ* where *nilam* is the object of the verb *kaṭantāṉ* and it has its suffix dropped according to Tol. Col. 103. When it means "one who has crossed the ground," evidently it is a compound. But Cēṉāvaraiyar is very obstinate in considering it a compound.[2] The reason he adduces in support of his opinion is that in Tol. E. 133, Tolkāppiyaṉār has stated that a noun which has its case suffix dropped is combined with the following verb so as to form a compound. Iḷampūraṇar gives a different interpretation to the same. The lines under consideration are

Peyarum toḻilum pirintoruṅku icaippa
Vēṟṟumai y-urupu nilaipeṟu vaḻiyun
Tōṟṟam vēṇṭā-t tokuti-k kaṇṇum...

The literal translation of these is as follows :—Noun and verb used separately or together, either with the case suffix of the noun expressed or dropped. Iḷampūraṇar interprets these lines thus :—*Peyarum toḻilum vēṟṟumai yurupu nilaipeṟu vaḻiyum, tōṟṟam vēṇṭāt tokutik kaṇṇum pirinticaippa*, and *peyarum toḻilum veṟṟumai yurupu nilai peṟu vaḻiyum tōṟṟam veṇṭāt tokutik kaṇṇum oruṅkicaippa*, which may be translated thus :—When a noun with, or without, a case suffix is followed by a verb and is treated as a separate word and when a noun with, or without, a case

---

1. *Paṇpai viḷakkum moḻi-tok kaṉavum.*
Oru-poruṭku irupeyar vantavum kuṇa-t-tokai. (Na. 365.)

2. Nīlaṅ-kaṭantāṉ, kuṉṟattiruntāṉ *eṉa-p-peyarum viṉaiyun tokkaṉa oru-coṉṉīrmai-y-ila-v-ākaliṉ tokai-y-eṉappaṭā v-eṉpārum-uḷar....vēṟṟumai-y-urupiṟ ṟoka-p-peyarun toḻilum oruṅkicaittal āciriyar nērntār-ākaliṉ, avai* tokai-y-ēṉavē paṭum. (Tol. Col. 420, Cēṉā.)

suffix is followed by a verbal noun and is treated as a part of a compound of which the verbal noun forms the second part— According to his interpretation, *nilattai-k kaṭantāṉ* and *nilaṅ kaṭantāṉ* are each *two separate words* when *kaṭantāṉ is a finite verb,* and *nilattai-k-kaṭantāṉ and nilaṅ-kaṭantāṉ* are COMPOUND WORDS when *kaṭantāṉ* is a *participial noun.*

Cēṉāvaraiyar interprets the same sūtra thus:—*peyarum toḻilum vēṟṟumai y-urupu nilai peṟu vaḻiyum pirinticaippa, peyarum toḻilum tōṟṟam vēṇṭā-t tokuti-k kaṇṇum oruṅkicaippa,* which may be translated thus:—when a noun with a case suffix is separate from the verb which it follows, and when without case suffix, it is treated as a part of the compound—(*i.e.*) He takes '*pirintù*' with the second line of the sūtra and '*oruṅkù*' with the third line unlike Iḷampūraṇar who takes both the second and third lines with both *pirintù* and *oruṅkù.* Besides, Cēṉāvaraiyar seems to think that the word *tokuti* in the third line means compound, since the same word in the sūtra '*Viṉai-y-iṉ ṟokuti kālat tiyalum*' (Tol. Col. 415) has that meaning. But the author has not used that word in that sense alone in the whole of his work. For he has used also in the sense of number according to Cēṉāvaraiyar and collection according to Iḷampūraṇar in the sūtra,

Iṉaittena aṟinta ciṉai-mutaṟ kiḷavikkù
Viṉai-p-paṭu tokuti-y-iṉ-ummai vēṇṭum (Tol. Col. 33).

It is a wonder to me why Cēṉāvaraiyar says so in spite of the fact that he is a sound Sanskrit scholar. What is the use of taking *nilaṅ kaṭantāṉ, yāṟu kaṭantāṉ, ūr-kaṭantāṉ,* etc., to be compounds when one can very easily take them as separate words?

From the points mentioned above, it may be clear that the interpretation of *tokai* as ellipsis mentioned by Dr. Pope in page xvii of the Introduction in Pope's edition of Tirukkuṟaḷ is not sound.

5. *SYNTAX.*

5. 1. *INTRODUCTION*: From the arrangement of the sections in Collatikāram, Tolkāppiyaṉār seems to have recognised that the unit of speech is a sentence. In the first section, *kiḷaviyākkam,* he says in the first eleven sūtras that the ending of the predicate must agree in gender, number and person with that indicated by the subject, and in the succeeding sūtras, he deals with the order of words in a sentence, the use of particular words in a context, etc. In the second section, the case suffixes and their function are dealt with, since the former are necessarily

found after nouns in a sentence. In the third section is mentioned the overlapping of case-functions and in the fourth, the vocative case. It is only at the beginning of the fifth section, *peyariyal*, Tolkāppiyaṉār defines *col* or word which forms a part of a sentence and classifies it primarily into two, noun and verb, and secondarily into four, noun, verb, *iṭaiccol* and *uriccol*. In the remaining portion of the fifth section, he deals with nouns; the sixth, seventh and eighth sections respectively deal with verbs, *iṭaiccol* and *uriccol* and the ninth and last, with miscellaneous topics like compunds, etc.

5. 2. *ORDER OF WORDS*: The normal order of words in a Tamil sentence is this:—The subject begins the sentence and the predicate ends it. (e.g.) *vāḷ valantara maṟuppaṭṭaṉa* (The sword was stained after giving victory) (P. N. 4. 1.); the predicate may be used at the beginning of the sentence when it is emphasised. (e.g.) *kaṇṭaṉeṉ kaṟpiṉukkaṇiyai-k-kaṇkaḷāl* (saw I with eyes the ornament of chastity) (Kampar. C. Tiruvaṭi. 58.) As regards the cases, the sixth case must invariably precede the noun which it qualifies. (e.g.) *ālai-vāy-k-karumpiṉ tēṉum* (the sweet boiled juice of the sugarcane at the mill), (Kampar. B. 469,) the second case generally precedes the verb, but the third and the fourth cases also intervene between them. (e.g.) *talaiyai vaṇaṅki* (bowing the head) (Cilap. 490, 33); *iṭamulai kaiyāl tiruki* (twirling the left breast with hand) (Cilap. 421. 43.); *vanta nampiyai muntai . . . nāṉmaṟai muṉikkukkāṭṭi* (having shown his brother to the sage learned in the four vedas) (Kampar. B. 233, 17.) When certain things are enumerated first and their total number is indicated by an enumerative word, such a word should be followed by *um*. (e.g.) *muracumuḻaṅku tāṉai mūvaruṅ kūṭi.* (all the three having assembled with their armies beating drums) (Pattu. 61.54). The past present, and future, participle invariably precede the noun which they qualify. (e. g.) *nutimaḻuṅkiya veṇkōṭṭāṉ* (with the white tusk whose end was blunted) (P. N. 4. 11). The nouns in apposition which denote the titles of persons generally precede the name of the person. (e.g.) *Teyvappulavaṉ Tiruvaḷḷuvaṉ.*[1] If nouns and pronouns are used in the same sentence denoting the same person, the pronoun is generally used after the noun.

---

1. *Ciṟappi ṉ-ākiya peyar-nilai-k kiḷavikkum*
Iyaṟ-peyar-k kiḷavi muṟpaṭa-k kiḷavār. (Tol. Col. 41.)

(e.g.) *Cāttaṉ avaṉ vantāṉ*, but the order may be inverted in poetry. (e.g.) *avaṉ . . . cēntaṉ pēr vāḻtti* (having blessed Cēntan) (Tol. Col. 32, Cēṉā.).

5. 3. *NUMBER*: Singular nouns with a collective sense take the singular verb.—(e.g.) *vaiyātu ulakam* (the world will not despise) (K. 117); plural forms are sometimes used as honorific singulars.—(e.g.) *yām ēttukam palavē* (I praise in many ways) (P. N. 10. 13.); plural forms of verbs are sometimes used along with the singular nouns and *vice versa*.—(e.g.) *aṟañ ceytīmō aruḷveyyōy* (P. N. 145, 7.), *yāvō yām kāṇkù* (Ka. T. Vol. 2, 497. 22.) Sometimes the plural forms of verbs are mixed with the singular forms. (e.g.) *uṇkum entai niṉ kāṇku vanticiṉ* (P. N. 125.4.) Sometimes two or more singular nouns connected by the particle *um* take a singular verb after them. (e.g.) *mātavar nōṉpum maṭavār kaṟpum kāvalaṉ kāval iṉṟù* (the celebacy and the chastity of holy women is not under guard) (E. M. 252, 208 and 209). *Oruvar* is the common form to denote either one man or one woman. (e.g.) *oruvarai-y-oruvar toṭantār* (one followed another) (Kampar C. Kiṅkarar, 25.) In case when one is not able to ascertain whether the person standing before him is a male or a female, the plural verb should be used. (e.g.) *āṇmakaṉ kollō peṇṭāṭṭi kollō iḵtō tōṉṟuvār* (is it man or woman that appears there).[1] The plural interrogative pronoun *yār* is used after singular nouns if the former is used as a logical predicate. (e.g.) *ivaṉ yār eṉkuvaiyāyiṉ* (if you ask who this man is) (P. N. 13.1).[2] Sometimes plural nouns are in apposition with singular nouns. (e.g.) *ēval iḷaiyar tāy vayiṟu karippa* (Tol. Col. 461, Cēṉā.)

5. 4. *TIṆAI*: Sometimes *aḵṟiṇai* nouns are used as *uyartiṇai* nouns and *vice versa* out of *affection* (e.g.) *eṉ-tantai vantāṉ* (with reference to a calf), *eṉ āṉai vantatù* (with reference to a son). Similarly *aḵṟiṇai* nouns are used as *uyartiṇai* and *vice versa* to denote *superiority*. (e.g.) *centār-p-pacuṅkiḷiyār* (C. C. 1036.), *maṉṉaṉ uyirttē malar talai-y-ulakam* (P. N. 186. 2.).

5. 5. *CONCORD*: The finite verb agrees with its subject in gender, number and person as is generally found in Sanskrit. If

---

1. *Pāṉ-mayak kuṟṟa v-aiya-k kiḷavi*
   Tāṉ-aṟi poruḷ-vayiṟ paṉmai kūṟal. (ibid. 23.)

2. If *yāvaṉ* is abbreviated into *yāṉ* as *yāvar* into *yār*, its form would have been the same as the singular of the first personal pronoun *yāṉ* and hence *yār* may have been used in all genders and numbers to avoid confusion.

two or more subjects of different persons are used, the plural verb of the first person is used if the subjects are of the first person, and either of the second or third persons or both, as *yāṉum nīyum pōṉōm, yāṉum avaṉum poṉōm* or *yāṉum, nīyum avaṉum pōṉōm*, and the plural verb of the second person is used if the subjects are of the second and third persons, as *nīyum avaṉum pōṉīr*. In respect of these two points there is similarity between Sanskrit and Tamil.[1] If the subject is made up of a *uyartiṇai* noun and an *aḵṟiṇai* noun, the verb that follows is in *uyartiṇai*. (e.g.) *Poṉṉaṉum kutiraiyum vantārkaḷ* (Poṉṉaṉ and his horse came) (Colloq.).

5. 6. *PRONOUNS*: Sometimes the word *ivaṉ* is used to denote the *first person singular*. (e.g.) *kāṇkivaṉ kaṭumpiṉatiṭumpai* (P. N. 173.2). *This is probably due to the desire of the speaker to address himself in the third person.* The form *ivaṉ* is used, but not *avaṉ*, since he is the nearest third person to himself. This is perhaps the reason why *iṅkū* is used in the sense of *eṉ' iṭattil* in Jaffna. Similar usage is found in the Cilappatikāram. (e.g.) *Parakati-y-iḻakkum paṇpu īṅku illai* (Cilap. 395, 85).

The reflexive pronouns *tāṉ*, *tām* and *tāṅkaḷ* are used in place of second person singular, *taṅkaḷ* when the person spoken to is a very great man, *tām* when he is great, and *tāṉ* when he is almost equal to the speaker in status. It is a peculiarity in colloquial speech that they are followed by a verb in the neuter singular. (e.g.) *tāṅkaḷ eppōtu vantatū; tām eppōtu vantatū; tāṉ eppōtu vantatū. Tām* and *tāṅkaḷ* are also followed by second person plurals of the form *vantīr* and *vantīrkaḷ* respectively. Sometimes *nām* is used instead of *the second person honorific singular*. (e.g.) *nammai orukāl kāṭṭivantāl* (P. T. 92. 1), *neru nal naṭantavarō nām* (Kampar. Āra. 238. 119). Such a usage is found in colloquial speech also. Similarly *atu* is also used in colloquial speech. (*e.g.*) *atu eṉṉa collukiṟatū*. Besides it may be interesting to note that the word *ivviṭattil* which is the seventh case of *ivviṭam* is used in the same sense. (*e.g.*) *ivviṭattil evvāṟu niṉaikkiṉṟatū* (How do you think?). The form *evaṉ* is used as a logical predicate after a neuter singular subject. (*e. g.*) *iccoṟku-p-poruḷ evaṉ*[2] (what is the meaning of this word?)

---

1. *Cf.* M. V. G. p. 290, S. 3.
2. *Yāteva n-eṉṉu m-āyiru kiḷavi-y-um*
Aṟiyā-p poruḷ-vayiṉ ceṟiya-t tōṉṟum. (Tol. Col. 31.)

5. 7. *CASES* AND *CASE SUFFIXES*: The cases from the first to the eighth are generally used in Tamil as in Sanskrit conveying the same sense, *i.e.*, the first case denoting the subject, the second the object,[1] the third the instrument, object in association or the doer, the fourth the recipient, the fifth the limit, comparison and cause, the sixth the ownership, and the seventh the time and the place of action. But we have many cases where one case form is used for another, *i. e.*, where functional syncretism plays its part.

The *third*, the *fourth*, the *fifth*, and the *seventh*, case are some times used in place of the *second*. (e.g.) *vāṉāl nōkki vāḻum*[2]; *ivaṭku-k-koḷḷum ivvaṉi*[3]; *paḻiyiṉ añcum*[4]; *aracarkaṭ cārntāṉ, kōṭṭiṉkaṭ kuṟaittāṉ*, etc. [5]

---

1. Following point may be noted here. Tolkāppiyaṉār does not state in Tol. Col. 71 that the second case denotes the object, but says that it is used with verbs. Since he says in Tol. Col. 112 that the subject, object, instrument, etc., are necessary for an action to be produced and he directly mentions the meanings of all the cases other than the second in the sūtras dealing with the other cases and the object is left out, we are made to infer that the second case denotes the object. The authors of the Nēminātam and the Naṉṉūl also have not definitely stated it. (N. N. Col. 17 and Na. 296.) It is *the author of* the *Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam* who has mentioned it. (I. V. 199.)

2. *Irantaṉ maruṅki ṉōkka ṉōkkam-a-v*
V-irantaṉ maruṅki ṉ-ētu-v-u m-ākum. (Tol. Col. 93.)

3. *Itaṉa titu-v-iṟ ṟeṉṉuṅ kiḷaviyum*
Ataṉai-k koḷḷum poruḷ-vayi ṉ-āṉum. (ibid. 110.)

4. *Acca-k kiḷavik k-aintu m-irantum*
Ecca m-ilavē poruḷ-vayi ṉ-āṉa. (ibid. 100.)

5. *Karuma m-allā-c cārpeṉ kiḷavikku*
Urimaiyu m-uṭaittē kaṇṇeṉ vēṟṟumai. (ibid. 84.)
Ciṉai-nilai-k kiḷavik k-aiyuṅ kaṇ-ṇ-um
Viṉai-nilai y-okku m-eṉmaṉār pulavar. (ibid. 85.)
Kaṉṟal celavu m-oṉṟumār viṉaiyē. (ibid. 86.)
Mutaṟ-ciṉai-k kiḷavi-k k-atu-v-eṉ vēṟṟumai
Mutaṟ-kaṇ variṉē ciṉai-k-k-ai varumē. (ibid. 87.)
Mutaṉ-mu ṉ-ai-variṟ kaṇ-ṇ-eṉ vēṟṟumai
Ciṉai-muṉ varuta ṟeḷḷi teṉpa. (ibid. 88.)
Mutaluñ ciṉaiyum poruḷ-vēṟu paṭāa
Nuvaluṅ kālai-c coṟ-kuṟip piṉavē. (ibid. 89.)

The *fourth* and *fifth* cases are sometimes used *in place of* the *third.* (e.g.) *avarku-c-ceyya-t-takum ikkāriyam*[1]; *'vaṇikattin āyinān*[2], *ampin āṭṭutum* (Kampar. B. 28, 3.) The *sixth* case is sometimes used for the *fourth.* (e.g.) *nākaratu pali.*[3]

The *fourth* case and the *second case* are sometimes used for the *fifth.* (*e.g.*) *cāttarku neṭiyan*[4]; *ninai-p-pānai nīṅkum tiru.* (K. 519). The *seventh* case is sometimes used for the *sixth.* (e.g.) *kāṭṭinkaṇ yānai.*[5]

The *third* and *fourth* cases are sometimes used for the *seventh* (e.g.) *īnmarō ivvulakattānē* (P. N. 74. 3.); *nālvarkku maruvil anpinil vērrumai mārrināl* (Kampar. A. 216. 5.)

Another point to be noted is that *all nouns without any case suffix* may be used if they *precede* the verbs that they qualify; but *only the suffix* of the *second case* and the *seventh case* may be dropped if the noun *follows* the verb. (e.g.) *uṇkuvam peruma nī nalkiya vaḷanē* (P.N. 136. 27.); *kaṇṭanen varuval ... kāṭē* (P. N. 23. 22.)

The order of cases and their meanings are quite similar to what is found in Pāṇini's grammar. The parallelism between '*mūnrākuvatī ... vinaimutal karuvi y-anai mutarratuvē* (Tol. Col. 73.) 'and' *kartṛkaraṇayōs tṛtīyā* (P. 2. 3. 18.)' is quite striking.

5. 71. As regards *the third case and its suffixes* there are a few points to be considered:—(1) The suffix that is mentioned by Tolkāppiyaṉar for the *third* case is *oṭu*;[6] but he mentions *āṉ* in the sūtra *ku-ai āṉ-eṉa varū m-iruti* .... (Tol. Col. 108) but does not state there that '*āṉ*' is the suffix of the *third* case. From the literature of the Sangam period it is determined as the third case

1. *Itana titu-v-ir r-ennuṅ kiḷaviyum*
Atanār ceyar-paṭar k-otta kiḷaviyum. (ibid. 110.)
2. *Mūnranu m-aintanun tōnra-k kūriya*
Ākkam-oṭu puṇarnta v-ētu-k kiḷavi
Nōkkō r-anaiya v-enmanār pulavar. (ibid. 92.)
3. Ku-t-toka varūṅ koṭai-y-etir kiḷavi
A-p-poru ḷ-ārar kurittu m-ākum. (ibid. 99.)
4. *Itana titu-v-ir rennuṅ kiḷaviyum*
Pāl-varai kiḷaviyum panpi n-ākkamum. (ibid. 110.)
5. *Āran maruṅkin vālcci-k kiḷamai-k-kū*
Eḷu m-āku m-urai-nilat tāna. (ibid. 98.)
6. *Mūnrā kuvatē*
Oṭu-v-ena-p peyariya vērrumai-k kiḷavi
Vinai-mutal karuvi y-anai-mutar ratuvē. (ibid. 73.)

suffix, since it is used instead of *oṭu*. (*e. g.*) *tūṅku kaiyā ṉ-ōṅku naṭaiya* (P N. 22. 1.) The later grammarians have taken it and its modified form *āl* as third case suffixes.

(2) The suffix *oṭu* in Tamil, when it denoted association, was used after the word denoting the *more important object.*[1] (e. g.) *tūmpuṭai-t-taṭakkai vāyoṭu tumintū* (P.N. 19. 10.); *māṇṭa-v-eṉmaṉaiviyoṭū makkaḷu nirampiṉar* (P. N. 191. 3.). Here it differs from Sanskrit where the third case suffix is used after the word denoting the *less important*. Cf. *sahayuktē apradhānē* (Pa. 2. 3. 19.) Besides, the suffix *āṉ* is also used in Sangam works to denote *association*. But later on, *i.e.*, before or after the time Naṉṉulār, the suffix *oṭu* alone came *to be restricted to denote association.*[2] and also it seems to have been used *after the noun denoting the less important*. (e.g.) *vanta nampiyait-tampi taṉṉoṭu . . . kāṭṭi* (Kampar. B. 233. 17.); *kuḷaṉoṭu natikaḷ taṅ kuṟaikaḷ tīravē* (Kampar. B. 164. 46.)

5. 72. In this context the following statement of Dr. Caldwell deserves to be considered. "Dravidian Grammarians have arranged the case system of their nouns in the Sanskrit order, and in doing so have done violence to the genius of their own grammar. The Dravidian ablative of motion and the locative are evidently one and the same case, though represented as different by grammarians, in deference to Sanskrit precedents; and the Dravidian social ablative, as some have called it or rather as it should be termed, the conjunctive case, though it takes an important position in the Dravidian Languages has been omitted in each dialect from the list of cases, or added on to the instrumental case, simply because Sanskrit knows nothing of it as separate from instrumental. The conjunctive or social stands in greater need of a place of its own in the list of cases in these languages than in Sanskrit, seeing that in these it has several case signs of its own, whilst in Sanskrit it has none.[3]

This statement of Dr. Caldwell, so far as *Tamil* is concerned, is based on two points :—(1) Mention of *il* as the suffix both of the fifth and the seventh cases by the author of the Naṉṉūl and the modern usage of *iṉ* before *kaṇ* of the seventh case as in *ūriṉkaṇ* and (2) Dr. Caldwell's mistaking the third case suffix

1. *Oru-viṉai y-oṭu-c-co l-uyar-piṉ vaḻittē.* (ibid. 91.)
2. *Mūṉṟā vataṉ-uru pāl-ā ṉ-ōṭoṭū*
   Karuvi karuttā uṭaṉikaḻ vataṉ-poruḷ. (Na. 297.)
3. C. D. G. 277 and 278.

oṭu to denote only association. His statement would have been correct if the author of Naṉṉūl or more correctly his commentators had arranged the cases.

But the arrangement of the cases was done not by Naṉnulār or his commentators, but by Tolkāppiyaṉār and his predecessors. Tolkāppiyaṉār does not at all give *'il'* as any case suffix. He has stated that *iṉ* is the fifth case suffix and that it denotes the limit or comparison and *kaṇ* is the seventh case suffix denoting time and place of action. Besides, in his time and even in later times, *oṭu* was used not only to denote *association*, but also to denote *instrument* in the same way as the suffix *āl* or *āṉ*. For instance, the sentence *koṭiyoṭu tuvakkuṇṭāṉ* means 'he was punished with a creeper and not 'he was punished along with a creeper'. Tolkāppiyaṉār has first stated that the suffix *oṭu* denotes the doer of the action, the instrument and then only that it denotes the association also. Besides *āṉ* also was used to denote association, e.g., *tūṅku-kaiyāṉ ōṅku naṭaiya.* (P. N. 22-1). Hence at the time of Tolkāppiyaṉār both *oṭu* and *āṉ* were used to denote instrument and association. The point why *oṭu* and *āṉ* were not treated as the suffixes of separate cases is fully discussed in Cēṉāvaraiyam, a commentary on Collatikāram of Tolkāppiyam under sūtra 74 of Collatikāram. Hence Dr. Caldwell's criticism on the arrangement of cases by Tamil grammarians cannot at all stand.

5. 7.3. The following parallelism may be seen in the use of cases between Tamil and Sanskrit:—

The third case is used to denote cause:

Tamil:	Sanskrit:
nalviṉaiyāl avaṉai-p-pārtteṉ:[1]	*puṇyena tam apaśyam*[2]

The fourth case is used instead of gerund in Tamil and instead of the infinitive of purpose in Sanskrit.

Tamil:	Sanskrit:
uṇavukku-c-ceṉṟāṉ for *uṇṇa-c-ceṉṟāṉ*[3]	*bhōjanāya yāti* for *bhōktum yāti.*[4]
tōṭṭukku-p-pōṉ[5]	*kuṇḍalāya svarṇam*[6]

1. *Innāṉ ētu.* (Tol. Col. 74.)
2. *Hētāu.* (P. A. 2.3.23.)
3. *Ataṟku uṭampaṭutal.* (Tol. Col. 76.)
4. *Tumarthācca bhāva vacanāt.* (P. A. 2.3.15.)
5. *Atuvāku kiḷavi.* (Tol. Col. 76.)
6. *Tādarthyē caturthī vācyā.* (Vārtika.)

The fifth case is used to denote contrast:

Tamil:	Sanskrit:
ivaṉ avaṉiṉ celvamuṭaiyōṉ	*eṣaḥ tasmāt ādhyataraḥ*[1]

There is a case of nominative absolute in Tamil with a noun in the nominative case followed by a gerund, e.g., *mukantaṉar koṭuppa . . . uḻuvai poṟikkum āṟṟalai* (P. N. 33. 6 to 9.) Here *koṭuttal* is the effect of his having been powerful. *malai peyya, kuḷam niṟaintatu.* Here *peytal* is the cause of *niṟaital*. Similarly, the form *ceyteṉa* is used instead of *ceya* in the above cases.

Such nominative absolutes are absent in Sanskrit; and the genitive and locative absolutes found in Sanskrit are absent in Tamil.

The author of the Pirayōkavivēkam mentions that '*pulli viṭāap pulaviyuḷ*' in '*pulliviṭā-pulaviyuḷ tōṉṟumeṉṉuḷḷam uṭaikkum paṭai*' is a case of locative absolute in P. V. p. 26. Since the form in Tamil has no similarity to that in Sanskrit, I do not agree with him. It may be taken only as a case of nominative absolute.

Cēṉāvaraiyar in his commentary under Tol. Col. 71 divides *ceyappaṭuporuḷ* or object into three classes. viz., *iyaṟṟappaṭuvatu* or that which is newly made, *veṟupaṭukkap-paṭuvatu* or that which is transformed and *eytappaṭuvatu* or that which is obtained or reached. This is possibly the translation of the following Kārikā in Bhartṛhari's Vākyapadīya:

> *nivartyam ca vikāryam ca prāpyam ca trividham matam,*
> *tatrepsitatamam karma . . .*
>
> (Vākyapadīya, 3rd Kāṇḍa, 45th Kārikā.)

5.8. *TENSES*: The *past* tense in Tamil is used for the *present* or the future to denote haste[2] or speed e.g.,*itō vanteṉ* meaning 'I am coming' or 'I shall come soon'. Sometimes the *past* is used for the *present* to denote certainty. e.g. *aṟinteṉ* for *aṟikiṟeṉ* (Ka. T. Vol. 2. 583. 7). Sometimes the *present* is used for the *future* as in Sanskrit[3] e.g., *Parataṉē tūṅka māmuṭi cūṭukiṉṟāṉ*

1. *Pañcamīvibhaktē.* (P. A. 2.3.42.);
2. *Vārā-k kālattu nikaḻuṅ kālattum*
   Orāṅku varūum viṉai-c-coṟ kiḷavi
   Iṟanta kālattu-k kuṟippoṭu kiḷattal
   Viraintu poruḷa v-eṉ-maṉār pulavar. (Tol. Col. 241.)
3. *Vārā-k kālattu viṉai-c-coṟ kiḷavi*
   Iṟappiṉu nikalviṉuñ ciṟappa-t tōṉṟum
   Iyaṟkaiyun teḷivuṅ kiḷakkuṅ kālai. (Tol. Col. 245.)

(Kampar, A. 216, 4.) and *āgacchāmi* for *āgamiṣyāmi*.[1] The *future* is used for the *past* and *vice versa*[2]. (e. g.) *malar micai-y-ēkiṉāṉ* (K. 3. Comm.)—here *ēkiṉāṉ* is used for *ēkuvāṉ*; *nilaiyal cevviteṉpa* (Tol. Col. 68)—here *eṉpa* is used for *eṉṟaṉar*; *cetteṉ* for *cāvēṉ* (T. V. 3. 165).

5. 9. *PARTICIPLES*: 'Participles are of a two-fold nature in as much as they share the characteristics of both noun and verb.' In form they are adjectives in concord. They not only govern cases like the verb, but also indicate time and differences of voice. The purpose that is served by relative pronouns in Sanskrit is served by the participles in Tamil.—(e.g.) '*kuṭattai-c-ceyta kuyavaṉ vantāṉ*' corresponds to the Sanskrit sentence '*yaḥ ghaṭam akarōt saḥ āgataḥ*,' which means the potter who made the pot came. The use of participles past, present and future is generally similar to that of participles in Sanskrit, though, in form, they are declined in the latter and they are not declined in the former. The use of participles denoting cause as *Harim paśyan mucyatē* (cf. *lakṣaṇahētvōḥ* (P. A. 3.1.126.) is not found in Tamil. The indeclinable past participle is used instead. (e.g.) *ariyai-p-pārttu vīṭu peṟṟāṉ*.

The Indeclinable past participles of the forms *ceytu*, *ceyyū* and *ceypu* are generally used to denote an action done by an agent previous to another action done by the same. Their use in Tamil is generally similar to the indeclinable participles in Sanskrit. The sūtras '*avaṟṟuḷ mutanilai mūṉṟum viṉaimutaṉ mutipiṉa* (Tol. Col. 230)' and '*ceyteṉ eccat tiṟanta kālam eytiṭa ṉuṭaittē vārāk kālam* (Tol. Col. 239)' convey almost the same idea as '*samānakartṛkayōḥ pūrvakāle* (P. A. 3.4.21.) But sometimes these indeclinable participles in Tamil are used as absolutes, when their subject denotes a part of the person denoted by the subject of the finite verb. (e.g.) *kai iṟṟu avaṉ vīḻntāṉ*. Very rarely are they used as gerunds. (e.g.) *nāvāy ōṭṭi vaḷitoḻil āṇṭa-v-uravōṉ maruka* (P. N. 66.1.) Here *ōṭṭi* is used in the sense of 'for steering'.

The gerunds of the form *ceyyiyar*, *ceyyiya*, *ceyaṟku*, *ceyteṉa* and *ceya* convey the same sense as the infinitive of purpose in Sanskrit. But there is difference in their use. *In Sanskrit the*

---

1. *Vartamāna sāmīpyē vartamānavadvā* (P. A. 3.3.131.)
2. *Iṟappē y-etirvē y-āyiru kālamuñ*
Ciṟappa-t tōṉṟu mayaṅku-moḻi-k kiḷavi. (Tol. Col. 247.)

infinitive of purpose always takes for its subject the subject, of the finite verb which follows.[1] *But in Tamil they may take the same subject or not.*[2] In the latter case we have the absolute construction. (e.g.) *maḻai peyya,kuḷam niṟaintatu.*

The form *ceyiṉ* is used to denote condition. Such an infinitive form is not found in Sanskrit. In the place of *ceyiṉ* Sanskrit has to use *'karōti cet.'*

Similarly, the form *ceyiṉum* is used in literature to denote contrast. It means 'though one does'. In its place Sanskrit generally uses an indeclinable participle followed by *api* as *kṛtvā api.*

In Tamil a number of finite verbs are used without the connecting particle. (e.g.) *vāḻttiṉeṉ paravutum* (Pari. 70.83.); *nīṟ kaṇṭaṉeṉ varuval* (P.N. 23.17.); *nī nalkiṉai viṭumati* (P. N. 136.24.) In such cases, all the finite verbs except the last are taken to be indeclinable participles by the author of the Naṉṉūl and the later grammarians.[3]

5.10. *PECULIAR INTERPRETATION OF CERTAIN CONSTRUCTIONS BY TAMIL GRAMMARIANS*: 5.10.1. In the sentence *'nampi poṉ periyaṉ'* which means *nampi* is great on account of wealth, Caṅkaranamaccivāyappulavar, a commentator on the Naṉṉūl says under the sūtra *'uyartiṇai toṭarnta . . .'* (Na. 377) that the word *nampi* is *uyartiṇai eḻuvāy* or subject and the word *poṉ is aḵṟiṇai eḻuvāy* and *the latter is peculiarly followed by the uyartiṇai predicate periyaṉ.*[4] When one reads the sentence, it may clearly appear that something is predicated of *nampi* and not *poṉ*; besides the predicative element is not confined to the word *periyaṉ* alone. Hence under the general rules of grammar it must be taken that *nampi* is the subject and the compound word *poṉ periyaṉ* corresponding to Sanskrit *dhanamahitaḥ* is the predicate or *periyaṉ* is the predicate and *poṉ* is the enlargement of the predicate in the sense of *poṉṉāl.* If *poṉ* and *periyaṉ* are taken to be two separate words, it may be easily said that *poṉ* is third

---

1. *Samāna-kartṛkēṣu tumun.* (P. A. 3.3.158.)
2. *Eṉai y-eccam viṉai-mutal-āṉum*
   Āṉ-van tiyaiyum viṉai-nilai y-āṉum
   Tām-iyaṉ maruṅkiṉ muṭiyu m-eṉpa. (Tol. Col. 232.)
3. *Viṉai-muṟṟē viṉai y-ecca m-ākalum*
   Kuṟippu-muṟ ṟīr-ecca m-ākalu m-uḷavē. (Na. 351.)
4. Na. C., p. 206.

case, with its third case suffix dropped according to the sūtra *Irutiyu m-itaiyu m-ellā-v-rupum—Neṟi-paṭu poruḷ-vayi ṉilavutal varaiyār.* (Tol. Col. 103) and the third case denotes cause as is sanctioned by the word *ētu* in Tol. Col. 74; or *poṉ periyan* may be taken to be a verb formed from a compound *poṉperumai.* The objection that is raised by Caṅkaranamaccivāyappulavar against the latter interpretation is that, in that case, it must have been *poṟperiyan* according to the rules of sandhi. Either this form may be brought under an exception, or the former interpretation may be accepted. It has a parallel in the sentence *avaḷ kaṇṇāl kottai* where the third case is used. Similarly *nampi poṉṉāl periyaṉ* has assumed the form of *nampi poṉ periyaṉ.*

If we carefully read through the sūtra *'uyartinai toṭarnta poruḷ mutalāṟum ataṉoṭu cārttin attinai muṭipiṉa'* (Na. 377) Caṅkaranamaccivāyappulavar seems to voice forth the opinion of Naṉṉūlār. One is at a loss to know why Naṉṉūlār should have chosen to suggest that explanation. *There is, in my opinion, no sūtra in Tolkāppiyam conveying the same idea*; but I have come into contact with Tamil Pandits who think that this sūtra is based on Tol. Col. 61. It may be considered here whether it is or not.

5.101. The sūtra referred to is this:—

Kaṇṇum tōḷum mulaiyum piṟavum
Paṉmai cuṭṭiya ciṉainilaik kiḷavi
Paṉmai kūṟuṅ kaṭappā ṭilave
Tamviṉaik kiyalu meḻuttalaṅ kaṭaiyē (Tol. Col. 61.)

This may be translated thus:—The words denoting the limbs as *kaṇ, tōḷ, mulai,* etc., which generally denote more than one (*i. e.*) two, *need not denote two except when they are followed by verbs suited to them,* i.e., *neuter plural verbs.* The examples which are given by Iḷampūraṇar under this sūtra are *kan, nallaḷ, tōḷ nallaḷ,* and *mulai nallaḷ,* He has not stated that the subject, in such cases, is *kaṇ, tōḷ* or *mulai.* But the later grammarians and the author of Naṉṉūl seem to have mistaken *kaṇ,* etc., to be in the nominative case and hence the subject of *nallaḷ,* etc.

I would prefer to interpret the sūtra as follows :—The words *kaṇ, tōḷ, mulai,* etc., which refer to objects forming natural pairs do not invariably denote the pair unless they are followed by a plural verb. Hence it is not absolutely necessary that a woman

should have both her eyes beautiful to be described as *avaḷ kaṇ nallaḷ*. Such a sentence would be appropriate even when one of the eyes was beautiful. To be more clear, I may take the example '*Kaṇṇaki mulai-y-ilāḷ*', which I have often heard used by recognised Pandits. It is known to every Tamil scholar that *Kaṇṇaki*, the heroine of the Cilappatikāram cut off one of her breasts and threw it away at Madura. Hence '*Kaṇṇaki mulai-y-ilāḷ*' does not mean that *Kaṇṇaki* is devoid of her *breasts*, but it means that *Kaṇṇaki* is devoid of *one breast*. Hence this sūtra does not deal with the *form* of words, but their *meaning*.

If such an interpretation is not given, I think that this sūtra is not necessary here and hence it may be omitted ; for, it is certain that Tolkāppiyaṉār would have taken only *avaḷ* as the subject of *nallaḷ* and hence the predicate *nallaḷ* agrees with the subject in gender and number.

One may question what the construction of *kaṇ* is, in '*avaḷ kaṇ nallaḷ*' according to this interpretation. As I said in the case of the form *poṉ periyaṉ*, one may take *kaṇ* as a separate word in third case with the case suffix dropped, or may take *kaṇṇallaḷ* as a compound acting the part of the predicate to *avaḷ*.

5.102. There are two more types of sentences where my explanation of the construction happens to differ from that ordinarily found in commentaries.

5.1021. '*Cākāṭum accu iṟum*' (K. 475) *represents one of these types*. On this Kuraḷ, Parimēlaḻakar writes that the *verb iṟum* which is suited to the word *accū* which denotes a part of the cart is used here as the predicate of the word *cākāṭū* (which denotes the whole). The sentence means 'the cart will have its axle broken.' Though it is the axle that breaks, the cart also may be said to break in its axle. Hence it seems to me that it is not absolutely necessary to take *iṟum* to be a *ciṉai-viṉai* or the verb suited to the *ciṉai* or part. Parimēlaḻakar has said so perhaps with the idea that *accū* is also a subject, as interpreted by Naṉṉūlār. (Cf. *poṉ periyaṉ* supra.) It has already been said that it is against the ordinary ways of expressing one's idea. Hence, in this sentence, *acciṟum* may be taken as the predicate of *cākāṭum* or *iṟum* may be taken as the predicate and *accū* as the seventh case singular with the case suffix dropped.

6.22. '*Aḷattaṟkariyai aṟivum īramum*' (P. N. 20. 516.) represents another type. The commentator on Puṟanāṉūṟu says

that the *cinai arivum* and *īramum* have taken for their predicate *aḷattarkariyai*, the verb suited to the *mutal* or the person having *arivu*, *īram*, etc. It is evident that the word *aḷattarkariyai* is second person singular and means 'you cannot be measured', and the words *arivu* and *īram* are each neuter singular meaning knowledge and compassion respectively. Hence the sentence may be taken to mean 'you cannot be measured in your knowledge and compassion'. Since *aḷattarkariyai* is second person singular, the word *nī* may be taken as the subject that is understood and *arivum* and *īramum* may be taken as nouns in the seventh case with the case suffixes dropped, since the dropping of the seventh case suffix in nouns which follow the predicates is allowed by the sūtra

Ai-y-uṅ kaṇ-ṇ-u m-allā-p poruḷ-vayin
Mey-y-urupū tokāa v-iruti y-āṉa. (Tol. Col. 105).

and such examples are found in plenty in literature.—(e. g.) *kaṇṭaṉeṉ varuval...kāṭē* (P. N. 23.22.)—Here *kāṭē* means *kāṭṭiṉkaṇṇē*; *tikaittaṉai pōluñ ceykai* (Kampar. K. 247.78.)—here *ceykai* means *ceykaiyiṉkaṇ*.

Hence I think that it is not necessary to formulate, as is done by the later grammarians, that the words which denote parts of a whole may take predicates after them which are suited to the whole, and *vice versa*.

CONCLUSION.

It may be evident from what has been said that Tolkāppiyaṉār clearly realised that Tamil was not related to Sanskrit either morphologically or genealogically and deftly exploited the ideas contained in the earlier grammatical literature in Sanskrit, particularly in those works which dealt with Vēdic etymology, without doing the least violence to the genius of the Tamil language. On the other hand, the large influx of Sanskritic elements in Tamil since the time of Tolkāppiyaṉār appears to have so far clouded the linguistic vision of the author of Vīracōḻiyam that he was led to assume close family relationship between Tamil and Sanskrit. Further the author of Vīracōḻiyam does not appear to have realised that Tolkāppiyaṉār's model was not Pāṇini so much as the Prātiśākhyas and the Nirukta. As a result of this important divergence in view-point, the Vīracōḻiyam proceeded to violently dragoon Tamil language and grammar into the

groove of Sanskrit—a feature which, in no sense, is traceable in Tolkāppiyam. It must, however, be conceded, in fairness to Vīracōḻiyam, that its author has brought within the scope of his grammar such changes in the Tamil language as had come about since the time of Tolkāppiyaṉār.

Naṉṉūlār was not a victim to the linguistic deflection which marred the value of the Vīracōḻiyam. While he adhered to the method of Tolkāppiyaṉār in respect of his fidelity to the genius of the Tamil language, he proceeded to complete the supplementing process initiated in the Vīracōḻiyam. A fateful periodicity appears to have characterised the line of Tamil Grammarians; for, the author of the Pirayōkavivēkam who came after Naṉṉūlār has lapsed with redoubled vigour into the Sanskritising groove of the Vīracōḻiyam.

But, luckily, the vitality of Tamil outlived all these grammatical vicissitudes. It is indeed gratifying that some of the latest grammarians—Vaittiyaṉātatēcikar, the Rev. C.J. Beschi and Civañāṉamuṉivar—have happily switched back to the healthy out-look and ideal of Tolkāppiyam.
